

STUDIA PATRISTICA

VOL. VIII

Papers presented to the Fourth International Conference
on Patristic Studies
held at Christ Church, Oxford, 1963

Part II

Patres Apostolici, Historica, Liturgica,
Ascetica et Monastica

Edited by

F. L. CROSS



AKADEMIE-VERLAG · BERLIN

1966

Die Kommission für spätantike Religionsgeschichte:
Friedrich Zucker (komm. Vorsitzender), Alexander Böhlig,
Hans Frhr. v. Campenhausen, Gerhard Delling, Hermann Dörries, Otto Eisfeldt,
Walther Eltester, Erich Fascher, Hermann Grapow, Werner Hartke,
Johannes Irmscher, Günther Klaffenbach, Johannes Leipoldt †,
Max Rauer, Harald Riesenfeld, Wilhelm Schneemelcher,
Imre Trencsényi-Waldapfel, Willem Cornelis van Unnik

Leiter der Arbeiten: Kurt Treu

Gutachter dieses Bandes: Walther Eltester und Johannes Irmscher
Redaktoren dieses Bandes: Fritz Jürß, Franz Paschke, Ursula Treu

Erschienen im Akademie-Verlag GmbH, 108 Berlin, Leipziger Str. 3-4

Copyright 1966 by Akademie-Verlag GmbH, Berlin

Lizenz-Nummer: 202 • 100/228/66

Gesamtherstellung: IV/2/14 VEB Werkdruck, 445 Gräfenhainichen • 2508

Bestellnummer: 2030/42 • ES 7 M

59,—

Table of Contents

Part II

V. Patres Apostolici

L. W. BARNARD , Winchester <i>Hermas and Judaism</i>	3
S. GIET , Strasbourg <i>Les trois auteurs du Pasteur d'Hermas</i>	10
S. GIET , Strasbourg De trois expressions: <i>Auprès de la tour, la place inférieure, et les premiers murs</i> , dans le <i>Pasteur d'Hermas</i>	24
S. G. HALL , Nottingham <i>Repentance in I Clement</i>	30
JOAN HAZELDEN WALKER , London An Argument from the Chinese for the Antiochene Origin of the <i>Didache</i>	44

VI. Historica

E. BÄMMEL , Cambridge <i>Die Täufertraditionen bei Justin</i>	53
A. HAMMAN O. F. M. , Besançon <i>«Sitz im Leben» des actes apocryphes du Nouveau Testament</i>	62
B. P. W. S. HUNT , Norwich <i>The Dialogue between Timothy and Aquila</i>	70
N. Q. KING , Makerere, Uganda <i>S. Joannis Damasceni De haeresibus cap. CI and Islam</i>	76
J.-M. LEBROUX , Versailles <i>Acace, évêque de Césarée de Palestine (341–365)</i>	82
C. RIGGI , Roma <i>La figura di Epifanio nel IV secolo</i>	86
I. P. SHELDON-WILLIAMS , London <i>The ps.-Dionysius and the Holy Hierotheus</i>	108
L. J. VAN DER LOO , Hilversum <i>Der numidische Manichäismus im vierten Jahrhundert</i>	118

F. E. VOXES, Dublin Zeno of Verona, Apuleius and Africa	130
R. E. WITT, London The Importance of Isis for the Fathers	135

VII. Liturgica

H. ASHWORTH O. S. B., Quarr The Relationship between Liturgical Formularies and Patristic Texts	149
L. BOUYER, Cong. Orat., Paris The Different Forms of Eucharistic Prayer and their Genealogy	156
AMY KEY CLARKE, Cambridge Licentius, <i>Carmen ad Augustinum</i> , ll. 45 seqq., and the Easter Virgil	171
C. COEBERGH O. S. B., Oosterhout Les <i>Libelli Sacramentorum</i> de saint Grégoire le Grand et le Sacramentaire publié sous son nom	176
J. D. CRIGHTON, Pershore Phases in Liturgical History	189
K. GAMBER, Regensburg Das Sakramenter von Salzburg als Quelle für das <i>Pragense</i>	209
S. M. GIBBARD S. S. J. E., Oxford The Eucharist in the Ignatian Epistles	214
P. W. HARKINS, Cincinnati Pre-Baptismal Rites in Chrysostom's Baptismal Catecheses	219
J. HENNIG, Basel Studies in Early Western Devotion to the Choirs of Saints	239
J. JANINI, Valencia Gelasio I y el Sermon <i>De neglecta solemnitate</i> (PL 54,433–444)	248
R. P. MARTIN, Manchester The Bithynian Christians' <i>Carmen Christo</i>	259
E. C. RATCLIFF, Cambridge Apostolic Tradition: Questions Concerning the Appointment of the Bishop	266
R. J. SCHORK, Washington Dramatic Dimension in Byzantine Hymns	271
H. E. SYMONDS C. R., Mirfield The Heavenly Sacrifice in the Greek Fathers	280
T. F. TAYLOR, Sherborne <i>Adesumus, Domine, Adesumus.</i> From Toledo IV to Vatican II	286
E. THEODOROU, Saloniki Der patristische Geist und der griechisch-orthodoxe Gottesdienst .	291
S. J. P. VAN DIJK O. F. M., London Recent Developments in the Study of the Old-Roman Rite	299

VIII. Ascetica et Monastica

A. M. ALLCHIN , Oxford The Appeal to Experience in the Triads of St. Gregory Palamas	323
L. BIELER , Dublin The Irish Penitentials: Their Religious and Social Background	329
N. CORNEANU , Timișoara Contributions des traducteurs roumains à la diffusion de l'Échelle de saint Jean Climaque	340
I. H. DALMAIS O. P., Paris L'héritage évagrien dans la synthèse de saint Maxime le Confesseur	356
J. C. GUY S. J., Toulouse Jean Cassien, historien du monachisme égyptien?	363
MARGUERITE HARL , Paris Recherches sur l'origénisme d'Origène: la «satiété» (<i>νόρωσις</i>) de la contemplation comme motif de la chute des âmes	373
J. KIRCHMEYER S. J., Les Fontaines Un commentaire de Maxime le Confesseur sur le Cantique?	406
W. P. LE SAINT S. J., Mundelein, Ill. <i>Traditio and Exomologesis</i> in Tertullian	414
R. T. MEYER , Washington Proverbs and Puns in Palladius' <i>Historia Lausiaca</i>	420
A. MUNDÓ , Montserrat Corrections «anciennes» et «modernes» dans le Sanctgall. 914 de la règle de Saint Benoît	424
F. X. MURPHY C. SS. R., Rome An Approach to the Moral Theology of St. Hilary of Poitiers	436
R. T. OTTEN , Grand Rapids Caritas and the Ascent Motif in the Exegetical Works of St. Ambrose	442
FRANCÉ QUÉRÉ-JAULMES , Cachan L'aumône chez Grégoire de Nysse et Grégoire de Nazianze	449
A. K. SQUIRE O. P., Oxford The Idea of the Soul as Virgin and Mother in Maximus the Confessor	456
J. VANNESTE S. J., Louvain La doctrine des trois voies dans la <i>Théologie Mystique</i> du Pseudo-Denys l'Aréopagite	462

Index of Authors

Allchin, A. M. 323
Ashworth, H. 149
Bammel, E. 53
Barnard, L. W. 3
Bieler, L. 329
Bouyer, L. 158
Clarke, A. K. 171
Coebergh, C. 176
Corneau, N. 340
Crichton, J. D. 189
Dalmais, I. H. 356
Gamber, K. 209
Gibbard, S. M. 214
Giet, S. 10.24
Guy, J. C. 363
Hall, S. G. 30
Hamman, A. 62
Harkins, P. W. 219
Harl, Marguerite 373
Hennig, J. 239
Hunt, B. P. W. S. 70
Janini, J. 248
King, N. Q. 76

Kirchmeyer, J. 406
Leroux, J.-M. 82
Le Saint, W. P. 414
Martin, R. P. 259
Meyer, R. T. 420
Mundó, A. 424
Murphy, F. X. 436
Otten, R. T. 442
Quéré-Jaulmes, France 449
Ratcliff, E. C. 266
Riggi, C. 86
Schorck, R. J. 271
Sheldon-Williams, I. P. 108
Squire, A. K. 456
Symonds, H. E. 280
Taylor, T. F. 286
Theodorou, E. 291
van der Lof, L. J. 118
van Dijk, S. J. P. 299
Vanneste, J. 462
Vokes, F. E. 130
Walker, Joan Hazelden 44
Witt, R. E. 135

V. PATRES APOSTOLICI

L. W. BARNARD

S. GIET

S. GIET

S. G. HALL

JOAN HAZELDEN WALKER

Hermas and Judaism

L. W. BARNARD, Winchester

The question of the relationship of the Shepherd of Hermas to Judaism presents difficult problems to the investigator. In a work consisting of visions and which abounds in allusive references and allegories we should not expect, and indeed do not find, any direct quotations from the O. T. The only explicit quotation in the whole book is from the lost apocryphal book of Eldad and Modat (Vis. II 3) which is classed among the apocrypha in the Athanasian Synopsis and in the Stichometry of Nicephorus but is not now extant. In his disuse of the O. T. Hermas differs from his near contemporaries Clement of Rome and the writer of Barnabas whose Epistles are steeped in the language of the LXX and reflect a Jewish background. It seems probable that Clement, Bishop of Rome, came of Jewish stock and that the author of Barnabas was a converted Rabbi or Magid who brought into the Church the exegetical methods, and particularly the Rabbinical Midrashim, of the synagogue. The Shepherd reflects a different background. Hermas is not an exegete concerned to demonstrate the fulfilment of the O. T. in the N. T. but a Christian prophet who, knowing the 'freedom of spirit', was concerned to grapple with fundamental moral problems which were troubling the Roman Church – in particular the questions of post-baptismal sin and the danger of close contact with pagan social influences. Hermas is not interested in Judaism as such. The Jewish nation and its privileges are never mentioned; neither is there anything about the distinction between Jew and Gentile – indeed an uninitiated reader of the Shepherd would not discover that the Jewish nation had ever existed. Michael is the guardian angel, not of the Jews, but of the Church. The twelve tribes refer not to the tribes of Israel, nor to the Apostles, but to the division of the human race into twelve nations (Sim. IX 17). Hermas recognises no ceremonial washings,

as in Judaism, and his work is singularly free from formalism and rigorism. Christian baptism alone is the rite which is essential but this had no antecedent in Jewish circumcision. Such then is the comparative neglect of Jewish institutions and traditions.

Caution is however needed before we conclude that Hermas is anti-Jewish. The contacts, short of direct quotation, which the book shows with the Epistle of James, one of the most 'Jewish' writings in the N. T., have been frequently noticed¹. Moreover the argument from silence in regard to Jewish sources is always a precarious one and the more so in the case of a Christian prophet possessed of the visionary faculty. Hermas was dealing with practical problems of Church life² rather than with doctrinal niceties and so the question of the fulfilment of the O. T. in the coming of Christ did not come within his purview.

There are, I believe, indications in the Shepherd that Hermas was acquainted with Jewish teaching and traditions not found in the N. T. or in early Christian literature – an interesting indication of the persistence of Jewish influence in the Church of the late first and early second centuries. Most of this teaching occurs in the Mandates and in the first five Similitudes that follow which, in their present form, appear as a Christianised version of the O. T. moral code. In this part of Hermas' work very few personal or family references, or precise indications of time or place occur, in comparison with Vis. I–IV. The writer is now drawing on a body of earlier teaching which had come down from the Jewish origins of the Church. We shall select just a few examples of this Jewish background:

a) The emphasis on Truth

In Mand. III 1–2 the Shepherd says to Hermas:

"Love truth: and let all truth proceed from your mouth, that the spirit which God has made to dwell in this flesh may be found true by all men, and the Lord who dwells in you shall thus be glorified, for the Lord is true in every word and with him there

¹ Whole sections are framed with a recollection of St. James' Epistle: e. g. Vis. III 9; Mand. II, IX, XI; Sim. V 4. Cf. also Mand. XII 5,6, James 4, 7. 12; Sim. VIII 6, James 2, 7.

² The best type of visionary and mystic is often an eminently practical person, e. g. Evelyn Underhill.

is no lie. They therefore who lie set the Lord at nought, and become defrauders of the Lord, not restoring to him the deposit which they received. For they received from him a spirit free from lies. If they return this as a lying spirit, they have defiled the commandment of the Lord and have robbed him".

Hermas is convicted by this revelation and weeps because he has "never yet in his life spoken a true word" – a note of false humility. He is then told that he ought to have walked in truth as God's servant, that an evil conscience ought not to dwell with the spirit of truth; from henceforth he is to keep the whole truth that he may obtain life for himself.

This teaching is different from that found in the Fourth Gospel where 'the truth' is the Christian revelation brought by and revealed in Jesus (Jn. 1,17; 14,6). For St. John there is no truth or love of truth apart from the Incarnate Son. In the Mandates, on the other hand, there is no mention of Jesus. Neither is loving and speaking the truth mentioned in the O. T. decalogue although it is implied in the negative command not to bear false witness against one's neighbour. Moreover in the early Christian lists of virtues and vices found in the "Two Ways" in Did. I–V and Barn. XVIII–XX, there is no mention of 'truth' among the precepts there listed, which appear to be based on earlier Jewish Christian or Jewish catechetical teaching. However in Jewish tradition there are many examples of the 'truth' being identified directly with the torah (the law) engraven on the heart¹, and in the Qumran Manual of Discipline III 13–IV 26, which appears to be a sermon accompanying the reading of the torah by the priests of the sect, we have a close parallel to this section of the Shepherd. We are told that God appointed Two Spirits – the spirits of truth and error. The origin of truth lies in the Abode of Light and that of error in the realm of darkness. These two spirits struggle for possession of the heart of man; "an abomination to truth are deeds of error, and an abomination to error are all ways of truth. And contentious jealousy is on all their judgements, for they do not walk together." While Hermas' theology does not have the dualistic emphasis of the Qumran sect there is nevertheless a correspondence between the earlier Jewish teaching and his idea of the 'truth' as being due to the activity of the Spirit of

¹ In Samaritan 'the Verity' (Qushtah) is a common term for the Law and in Mandaean thought truth (Kushta) is virtually mystic revelation. See T. H. Gaster, *The Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect*, p. 305.

truth within the human heart. There is an inwardness and a mystical side to Hermas' teaching which is similar to that found at Qumran; it is different from the more external and legalistic form which Jewish and Jewish Christian teaching later took in the "Two Ways". This we will now consider.

b) The Two Angels and the Two Ways or Paths

The metaphor of two ways of life, or two paths, which men can choose to follow, is a familiar one in Classical Literature where it can be traced in the "antitheses" of Heraclitus, in Hesiod, Theognis and Xenophon; in the O. T. it is found in Deut. 11,26 seq., 30,15–19; Jer. 21,8; and in Ps. 1. This metaphor was taken up by Our Lord in his famous saying recorded in Mt. 7,13–14: "Enter ye in by the narrow gate: for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many be they that enter in thereby. For narrow is the gate, and straitened the way, that leadeth unto life, and few be they that find it". In this teaching the emphasis is on the outward following of the straight and narrow *path*, the way of life or light, and the avoidance of the opposite path. There is a similar emphasis in Mand. VI 2: "For that which is righteous has a straight path, but that which is unrighteous a crooked path. But do you walk in the straight path, but leave the crooked path alone". This could easily be taken as another version of the familiar *verba Christi*; cf. also Jn. 11,9–10. But in Mand. VI 2,1. seq. Hermas introduces the conception of two angels with men, one of righteousness and one of wickedness, who dwell in men's hearts causing good and evil dispositions. In reply to the Angel of Repentance Hermas says:

"How then, sir, said I, shall I know their workings, because both angels dwell with me? Listen, said he, and understand them. The Angel of righteousness is delicate and modest and meek and gentle. When, then, he comes into your heart he at once speaks with you of righteousness, of purity, of reverence, of self control, of every righteous deed, and of all glorious virtues. When all these things come into your heart, know that the angel of righteousness is with you."

Then follows a list of the dispositions caused by the presence of the angel of wickedness; ill temper (was this one of Hermas' failings – he often mentions it?), bitterness, desire of many deeds,

over eating and drinking, desire for women, covetousness, haughtiness and pride. Hermas is then commanded "to follow the angel of righteousness, but to keep away from the angel of wickedness" (Mand. VI 2,9)

This conception of the Two Angels or Impulses, one good, one evil (also found in Mand. XII 1), finds an exact parallel in the Rabbinic *yetzer ha-tob* and *yetzer ha-ra* mentioned in many Jewish writings (e. g. Eccl. 15,11–14; IV. Ezra 3,21; 4,30 seq.; Test. Asher I 6). The general view among the Rabbis was that the sphere where the struggle for mastery between good and evil impulses occurred was the heart which stood for the volitional and intellectual elements in man. It was a man's will and mind which the evil impulse attacked urging him to all kinds of sin. The chief means of protection against this impulse was the study of the torah. Thus "In the school of R. Ishmael it was taught: If this abomination meets you, drag it to the House of Study; if it is hard as stone it will be crushed: if it is hard as iron, it will be broken in pieces" (Ber Kidd. 30. b). There can be little doubt that behind the "Two Angels" and "Two Desires" of Hermas is much earlier Jewish teaching. The discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls has confirmed this for, as we have already mentioned, in Manual Discpl. III 13.—IV 26 two Spirits are described as struggling for possession of men's hearts and the lists of virtues and vices (the latter perhaps based on the *Vidui* of the Day of Atonement) associated with the Two Spirits bears a general resemblance to Hermas' lists —indeed almost all the virtues and vices he mentioned can be paralleled at Qumran.

A further confirmation of Hermas' Jewish background is provided by his frequent use of the word "double-mindedness" in connexion with that disunity of the heart which renders a man vulnerable to the assaults of temptation (Vis. II 2,4; III 7,1; Mand. X 1,2; 2,4). It is double-mindedness which causes men to forsake the true way and those who do so are following evil desires. Behind Hermas' use of this word lies the familiar Rabbinic teaching of the two *yetzirim* or impulses already mentioned.

What is interesting is the presence of Jewish traditions and ways of thought in the Church of Rome in the late first and early second centuries. Judaism had a far greater influence on the developing thought of the early Church than is often realised —even on writers who show no great interest in Judaism. As Père

² Cross, *Studia Patristica* VIII

Daniélou has said, much of the theology of the early Church came out of a late Jewish environment.

c) The Emphasis on Jewish Monotheism and the Fear of God

Mand I 1–2 reads: ‘First of all believe that God is one, ‘who made all things and perfected them, and made all things to be out of that which was not’, and contains all things, and is himself alone uncontained. Believe then in him, and fear him, and in your fear be continent. Keep these things, and you shall cast away from yourself all wickedness, and shall put on every virtue of righteousness, and shall live to God, if you keep his commandment.’

It is significant that in this introductory Mandate there is no command to love God, no mention of the Trinity, as might be expected in a Christian work which nowhere directly quotes the O. T., but rather a free expansion of the Decalogue’s “Thou shalt have none other gods but Me”. The mention of the creation *ex nihilo* appears to be based on II Macc. 7,28 and Wisd. 1,14.

The command to believe and fear the One God is characteristically Jewish and is re-iterated throughout the Mandates. Indeed a whole Mandate (VII) is devoted to this commandment . . . “the fear of the Lord is mighty and great and glorious”. Hermas even states that people with “might” or “power” gain the fear of the Lord (Mand. VII 2). Nowhere does love or meekness balance fear as in the N. T. writings. In this Hermas is at one with the O. T. and Jewish tradition (cf. Ps. 111,10; Ecclus. 40,26; *Pirke Abot* III 13).

d) Life

The Shepherd many times states that those who keep the commandments will “live unto God” – a theme constantly reiterated throughout the work. Indeed almost every Mandate ends with this phrase. There is nothing in the book to connect this “living with God” with the work of Christ as in the Johannine literature. Hermas never states that this life is the gift of God mediated through Jesus Christ. It would seem that he is here drawing on a Jewish background of thought. Thus Prov. 8,35 says of the Divine Wisdom: “Whoso findeth me findeth life, and shall

obtain favour of the Lord". In Judaism the torah was the supreme means of life for men; so Eccl. 17,11: "He added unto them knowledge, and gave them a law of life for a heritage". "The more a man studies and obeys the commands of the torah the more life he has" (saying ascribed to Hillel). "As oil is life for the world, so also are words of torah life for the world" (Deut. R. 7,3). It is true that the idea of life is also found in Hellenistic religious and philosophical thought – indeed a fundamental principle of Gnostic thought is that only the bestowal of knowledge can give life. But in Hellenistic thought life is not obtained through the keeping of God's commandments as is constantly stated by Hermas. It therefore seems probable that his emphasis on 'life' and 'living unto God' comes from his familiarity with Jewish ways of thought.

e) *The Holy Spirit represented by Virgins*

Hermas, as a Christian prophet, emphasises the work of the Holy Spirit. Nevertheless there are indications of Jewish influence at work in the way he depicts the Third Person of the Trinity. The Hebrew for Spirit being feminine the Spirit was sometimes represented symbolically as a woman. Hermas goes further and resolves the one woman into seven in Vis. III and into twelve Virgins in Sim. IX. These by their plurality represent the distributions of the Holy Ghost although their oneness and significance are carefully indicated by the expression, "clothed in the Holy Spirit of these Virgins" (Sim. IX 24,2).

Les trois auteurs du *Pasteur d'Hermas*

S. GIET, Strasbourg

Peut-être certains d'entre vous, en lisant sur le programme que je vous parlerais des trois auteurs du *Pasteur d'Hermas*, ou, ce qui revient au même, *d'Hermas et des Pasteurs*, m'auront soupçonné d'hypercritique et d'iconoclasme!

Le *processus* que j'ai suivi, et qu'il m'était difficile de ne pas suivre, est pourtant des plus simples . . . Certes, ce ne m'est pas, comme au Valmajour d'Alphonse Daudet, «venu de nuit en écoutant chanter le rossignol»! Mais l'idée de cette tripartition s'est progressivement imposée à moi, au lendemain de la communication que j'avais faite ici-même, en 1959, sur *l'Apocalypse d'Hermas et la pénitence*¹.

Je vous dirai comment cette hypothèse s'est d'abord présentée, puis j'entrerai au cœur de mon sujet, et je vous exposerai la méthode que j'ai suivie, les résultats auxquels je crois être parvenu, enfin les perspectives que ceux-ci me semblent ouvrir pour une meilleure connaissance du IIe siècle chrétien.

En lisant le livre très estimable que M. Robert Joly a donné à la collection des *Sources Chrétiennes* sur le *Pasteur d'Hermas* et la fort bonne édition de Miss Molly Whittaker, j'avais acquis la conviction (je l'ai toujours) que l'on ne pouvait prêter à Hermas l'idée d'une pénitence unique (je veux dire d'un pardon qui ne pourrait être réitéré, sinon par Dieu, du moins par l'Eglise), sans mettre l'auteur en contradiction avec lui-même; et qu'un bon nombre des expressions sur lesquelles se fonde cette théorie, s'expliquent simplement par la proximité où l'auteur se croit être des derniers temps.

En poursuivant mon enquête, je dus constater que les visées eschatologiques d'Hermas, pour autant qu'Hermas est l'auteur de l'ensemble du *Pasteur* qui porte son nom, n'étaient pas identiques...

¹ *Studia Patristica* III, T. U., 78, Berlin, 1961, p. 214–218.

Mais avant d'aller plus avant dans cet exposé, peut-être n'est-il pas inutile de rappeler brièvement comment se présente, dans nos éditions, le *Pasteur d'Hermas*?

Il comprend, vous le savez, cinq *Visions*, douze *Préceptes* et dix *Paraboles* ou *Similitudes*.

Les *Visions* ont pour bénéficiaire un certain Hermas qui nous parle volontiers de lui, de sa famille, de ses états d'âme : à plusieurs reprises, une femme âgée lui est apparue qui lui a adressé des reproches, des avertissements, mais aussi des encouragements. Il finira par apprendre que cette femme n'est autre que l'Eglise ; c'est au nom de celle-ci qu'il transmettra un appel pressant à la pénitence, appel qui, destiné d'abord à lui-même et aux siens, s'étendra finalement à toute la communauté chrétienne.

A partir de la Ve *Vision* (je passe en effet sur la IVe qui est un complément destiné à souligner le caractère eschatologique des *Visions* précédentes), l'Eglise est relayée dans son rôle d'intermédiaire divin par un Pasteur qui dispensera ses propres enseignements dans les *Préceptes* et *Paraboles* que nous savons.

Les *Préceptes* sont à la fois une énumération des devoirs comme est le décalogue, et un ensemble d'instructions qui constituent une sorte de traité de morale théorique et pratique. Ainsi le premier *Précepte* a-t-il pour objet la foi monothéiste et les conséquences qui en découlent : Avant tout, crois qu'il n'y a qu'un Dieu qui a tout créé . . . ; crains-le et tu rejetteras tout mal ; tu revêtiras toute vertu de justice. Le deuxième prône la simplicité d'âme par laquelle on pratique sans détour justice et charité envers le prochain. Puis viennent des *Préceptes* sur la sincérité et l'amour de la vérité, la chasteté dans le mariage, la patience, et, après un retour sur la foi, la crainte de Dieu et la maîtrise de soi, des mises en garde contre le partage de l'âme, la tristesse, l'enseignement des faux prophètes, et tout mauvais désir.

Mais les *Préceptes* sont autre chose encore ; car, à propos de la plupart d'entre eux, le Pasteur donne des explications, répond aux questions de son disciple, résout des cas de conscience, entre dans des considérations qui n'ont parfois qu'un rapport assez lointain avec le *Précepte* lui-même qui en est l'occasion. On a plutôt l'impression d'une parénèse telle qu'elle pouvait se pratiquer dans les synagogues ou devant les premières assemblées chrétiennes.

Quant aux *Paraboles*, elles sont, comme le mot l'indique, des allégories qui servent de cadre à des exhortations : exhortations au détachement, à la charité envers le prochain, à la pénitence . . .

Voilà donc comment se présente le *Pasteur*; mais vous verrez que la critique interne nous orientera vers un tout autre clivage.

Je vous disais en effet que les visées eschatologiques (ce fut ma première constatation dans ce genre de recherche) n'étaient pas identiquement les mêmes dans les différentes parties du *Pasteur*.

Dans les *Visions*, la fin des temps est proche; et déjà une limite est fixée à partir de laquelle les fidèles qui tomberaient dans le péché ne pourraient plus faire leur salut, tandis que, pour les gentils, la pénitence reste possible jusqu'au dernier jour.

Dans les *Préceptes* et la plupart des *Paraboles*, la perspective de ce dernier jour s'estompe devant «la préoccupation de tracer des règles de vie pratiques en tous temps» (Je cite ici le P. d'Alès qui, dans son *Édit de Calliste*, aux pages 82-83, a fort bien noté cette différence).

Dans la IXe *Parabole* toutefois, s'il n'est pas plus question que dans les autres d'une limite, ni même d'une fin immédiatement attendue, le retard de la parousie s'explique par une pause qui a été ménagée au cours de la construction de la tour, non seulement pour que le Maître inspecte le travail, mais pour que les pécheurs aient le temps de se repentir (91,2).

La fin du monde, d'imminente qu'elle était dans les *Visions*, est devenue lointaine dans les *Préceptes*; elle est seulement retardée dans la IXe *Parabole*.

I. La méthode

En elles-mêmes, ces différences seraient susceptibles de toutes sortes d'explications, car le *Pasteur* est complexe à plus d'un titre: qu'il soit ou non composé de plusieurs écrits, il est fait en partie de réemplois . . .

Mais une fois ma recherche ainsi amorcée, je n'ai pas tardé à constater l'existence de sutures maladroites et de justifications inconsistantes qui se rencontrent précisément entre les quatre premières *Visions* et les *Préceptes*, avant et après la IXe *Parabole*.

Cette constatation est, je crois, de grande importance. Nombreux ont été depuis un siècle les chercheurs et les savants qui ont essayé de percer l'énigme du *Pasteur d'Hermas*. Il paraît tellement évident que le *Pasteur* n'est pas une œuvre jaillie d'un seul jet! Or, si les tentatives antérieures (je songe spécialement à celles d'Hilgenfeld, de Spitta, de Grosse-Brauckmann, pour n'en

citer que quelques unes) n'ont pas eu le succès qu'en espéraient leurs auteurs, c'est, je pense, qu'ils ont trop négligé de faire une juste discrimination entre les indices de simples réemplois ou remaniements de moindre importance, et d'autres qui témoignent d'interpolations ou de véritables falsifications. Vous pensez bien qu'il est plus intéressant de suivre la piste d'un faussaire, quand on a eu la chance de la déceler, que de relever les arrangements mineurs que n'importe quel auteur ne manque pas d'apporter lui-même dans son œuvre, ou même les emprunts dont il l'a enrichie.

De ces sutures et prétendues justifications, je vais vous donner quelques exemples.

Peut-être vous rappelez-vous la scène dont est faite la Ve *Vision*? Tandis que jusqu'alors le Voyant a reçu ses révélations de la femme âgée en qui on finit par lui faire reconnaître l'Eglise, voici que soudain se présente à lui «un homme d'apparence glorieuse, en habits de Pasteur». Ce dernier lui dit: «J'ai été envoyé pour te montrer à nouveau ce que tu as vu précédemment, les points principaux (ou les chapitres) que voici, et qui tendent à votre utilité. Tout d'abord, écris mes *Préceptes* et mes *Paraboles*; le *reste*, tu l'écriras selon que je te l'indiquerai. Si je t'ordonne d'écrire d'abord *Préceptes* et *Paraboles*, c'est pour que tu les aies sous la main, que tu les lis es et puisses les observer . . .» (25,2-6).

Cette transition est étrange; car les *Paraboles* sont, il est vrai, des exhortations dont l'une, celle de la tour, offre de grandes ressemblances avec la IIIe *Vision*; mais les *Préceptes* sont des instructions sans analogie avec ce qui les précède. Ils forment, nous l'avons dit, une sorte de code de vie morale . . . Or, si l'on trouve dans les *Visions* des considérations sur la pénitence et les principes généraux de la morale, on n'y voit rien qui annonce même de loin l'enseignement du Pasteur: celui-ci en a certainement conscience, puisque, tout en introduisant ses instructions par manière de simple redite, il ordonne au Voyant d'écrire d'abord les *Préceptes* et les *Paraboles* pour qu'il les ait à sa disposition, qu'il puisse les lire et les observer. L'urgence des *Préceptes* ne se justifierait pas, s'ils ne faisaient que répéter les exhortations précédentes . . . Comment ne pas voir dans cette gaucherie ou cette inadvertance l'indice d'un arrangement frauduleux?

Quel est d'autre part ce mystérieux *reste* que le Voyant écrira seulement quand son guide le lui dira? On ne connaît généralement, nous l'avons vu, dans la suite du *Pasteur* que douze

Préceptes et dix Paraboles dont la tradition, sans être unanime sur la manière de les compter, ne met aucun ou aucune à part des autres . . . Il est vrai cependant qu'il y a un *reste*: celui-ci fait l'objet d'une mention explicite vers la fin de l'œuvre. Aux toutes dernières lignes de la VIII^e *Parabole*, le Pasteur dit en effet: «Le reste, je te l'expliquerai dans quelques jours» (77,4–5).

Or la nouvelle transition qui suit ces mots (ce sera notre second exemple), transition que nous lisons en tête de la IX^e *Parabole*, n'est pas moins embarrassée que celle de la Ve *Vision*. La voici: «Quand j'eus écrit les *Préceptes* et les *Paraboles* du Pasteur, l'ange de la pénitence, (il) vint donc à moi et me dit.» La phrase peut vous sembler incorrecte ou redondante: elle est en réalité calquée sur le texte grec où le sujet n'est explicitement, je ne dis pas exprimé, mais suggéré que par des génitifs: *Μετὰ τὸ γράμμα με τὰς ἐντολὰς καὶ παραβολὰς τοῦ ποιμένος, τοῦ ἀγγέλου τῆς μετανοίας, ἥλθε πρός με . . .* (78,1): «Je veux te montrer tout ce que t'a montré l'esprit saint qui t'a parlé sous la forme de l'Eglise, car cet esprit est le fils de Dieu. Aussi longtemps en effet que tu étais trop faible en ta chair, il ne te fut rien révélé par l'intermédiaire d'un ange. Mais une fois affermi par l'esprit, et doué d'assez de forces pour soutenir la vue d'un ange, tu as pu, grâce à l'Eglise, voir se construire la tour: tout cela, tu l'as vu d'une manière belle et sainte, comme du fait d'une vierge. Maintenant tu vois du fait d'un ange, mais grâce au même esprit. Il faut toutefois qu'avec moi, tu voies tout d'une manière plus précise. Car j'ai été commis par l'ange glorieux à cette fin d' habiter en ta demeure, pour que tu voies tout parfaitement sans plus rien craindre comme précédemment» (78,1–4).

Cette transition reliera bien la IX^e *Parabole* aux révélations faites par l'Eglise dans les *Visions*; mais on n'y trouve, pour rappeler l'ensemble des *Préceptes* et des huit premières *Paraboles* que cette petite phrase dont la bizarrerie ne vous échappera pas: *Νῦν δὲ ὑπὸ ἀγγέλου βλέπεις, διὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ μὲν πνεύματος, δεῖ δέ σε ἀκριβέστερον ὑπ’ ἔμοι πάντα ἰδεῖν.* «Maintenant tu vois grâce à un ange, qui certes est inspiré par le même esprit; mais il faut que par moi tu voies tout d'une façon plus précise».

Je ne vous lirai pas le commentaire lénitif et pieux qu'un auteur généralement mieux avisé, Auguste Lelong, a cru jadis pouvoir faire de ce passage¹. Pour moi, l'explication est des plus

¹ A. Lelong, *Le Pasteur d'Hermas*, dans la Collection des Textes et Documents d'Hemmer et Lejay, Paris, 1912, p. 222–223.

simples. La transition primitive était destinée à relier la IXe *Parabole* aux *Visions*: «Une fois que tu fus affermi, dit en effet le Pasteur, te fut montrée par l'intermédiaire de l'Eglise, la construction de la tour . . .». Mais lorsqu'eut été inséré dans l'intervalle tout ce qui sépare ces deux parties, il fallut bien faire allusion à ces compléments: d'où cette discrète incise: *νῦν δὲ ὑπὸ ἀγγέλου βλέπεις*. «Maintenant tu vois du fait d'un ange». Oui! Mais le jeu des particules (le nouveau *δέ* s'offrant au *μέρ* précédent et laissant l'autre *δέ* sans correlatif) ne s'en trouvait-il pas faussé? L'interpolateur crut rétablir l'équilibre en ajoutant: *διὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ μὲν πνεύματος*. «C'est certes grâce au même esprit».

Pour l'œil, c'était parfait; mais au prix de quelles entorses à la logique et à la théologie! Car, d'une part, l'interlocuteur qui dit: «Il faut que par moi, tu voies tout d'une manière plus précise», est le même ange par qui ont été ménagées les révélations précédentes; et d'autre part, la nouvelle opposition *μέρ*—*δέ* donne à penser que la révélation va désormais procéder d'une autre manière, et se faire sans l'assistance du saint esprit . . . Tout cela sent la forgerie! . . .

Dans cette transition, il y a enfin quelque chose qui paraît plus surprenant encore. Ce sont les mots du début: «Je veux te montrer tout ce que t'a montré l'esprit saint qui t'a parlé sous la forme de l'Eglise; car cet esprit est le Fils de Dieu: *ἐκεῖνο γάρ τὸ πνεῦμα ὁ νίκος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστιν*» (78,1). Cette assertion selon laquelle le Fils s'identifie à l'esprit n'est pas seulement isolée dans la IXe *Parabole*; elle y est nettement contredite. Si l'on veut lui trouver un pendant, c'est dans la Ve *Parabole* qu'il faut le chercher: la même phrase s'y trouve littéralement d'après la plus ancienne des traductions latines, la Vulgate du *Pasteur*, qui fait autorité, parce qu'on la date de la fin du IIe siècle, et que ses leçons sont assez souvent corroborées par celles des plus anciens manuscrits grecs; à son défaut, c'est tout l'enseignement de la Ve *Parabole* qui postule la même doctrine.

Le temps m'empêche de vous en dire plus. Car, si nets que soient les faits que nous avons relevés dans les transitions, ils ne suffisent pas à prouver que le *Pasteur d'Hermas* est l'œuvre de plusieurs auteurs. La preuve, si elle est faite, ne peut l'être que par la convergence de multiples indices dont certains paraîtront décisifs . . .

C'est la méthode (vous me permettrez cette parenthèse) que j'ai suivie jadis dans l'étude historique que j'ai faite de l'Apocalypse johannique.

La coïncidence de certaines allusions et des indications de durée qui se trouvent dans l'*Apocalypse*, avec les faits de l'histoire de la guerre juive, tels que les relate Flavius Josèphe, avait éveillé mon attention: mais ces rencontres pouvaient être le fait du hasard!

L'étude méthodique de l'ensemble de l'œuvre à la lumière de la même histoire, en multipliant les indices et en éclairant toutes sortes d'obscurités, rendit à mes yeux l'hypothèse beaucoup plus probable.

Mais finalement, c'est de voir apparaître inopinément, dans l'œuvre du Voyant de Pathmos, à la place de confuses et douteuses redites (ces répétitions ou récapitulations dont on a trop facilement parlé), un rigoureux parallélisme entre le passé et l'avenir, de chaque côté de cette ligne de faite que forme le triple avertissement, on ne peut plus actuel et tragique, de la Ve *Vision*: «Si quelqu'un adore la bête et son image . . . , il boira du vin de la fureur de Dieu! . . . Heureux dès maintenant les morts qui meurent dans le Seigneur!» (*Apoc.*, 14,9–13), qui a fini par emporter ma conviction: entre tous les indices celui-là me paraissait particulièrement décisif pour fonder l'hypothèse que j'ai proposée.

Ainsi en est-il d'Hermas – mais avec Hermas, nous ne sommes plus dans le simple domaine des hypothèses. Les transitions dont je viens de vous parler fournissent des indices curieux; ceux-ci appellent une étude méthodique de l'œuvre entière. Peut-être parmi les observations que cette étude nous permettra de faire, en est-il qui emporteront la conviction.

Je ne vais pas, dans le temps dont je dispose, vous inviter à refaire avec moi cette enquête: je me propose seulement de vous en indiquer les principaux résultats. Ce sera la seconde partie de notre exposé.

II. Les résultats de l'enquête

Ni la doctrine qui s'exprime dans les sections du Pasteur délimitées par ces transitions (j'entends: 1° les quatre premières *Visions*, 2° les *Préceptes* et les *Paraboles* I–VIII, X, et 3° la IXe *Parabole*), ni les allusions au contexte historique que l'on y trouve, ni certaines particularités du vocabulaire ne permettent d'attribuer l'ensemble à un ni même à deux seuls auteurs . . .

Que penser d'une œuvre où l'on commence, dans les vingt quatre premiers chapitres, par nommer habituellement les fidèles: des élus (*ἐκλεκτοί*) — le mot revient neuf fois dans ces vingt quatre chapitres —, des saints (*ἅγιοι*) — le mot revient dix fois —; et par s'adresser à eux en leur disant: frères (*ἀδελφοί*) — on le fait huit fois —; pour ensuite cesser subitement de les désigner par ces mots? Des trois, un seul: *ἅγιοι* paraît, mais une seule fois, dans les quatre vingt dix autres chapitres! Ces fidèles, il faut tout de même les nommer! Quand le besoin s'en fera sentir, on usera d'autres termes ou périphrases que je cite un peu au hasard. On dira: «les serviteurs de Dieu» (*οἱ δοῦλοι τοῦ θεοῦ*) (50,1; cf. 29,8; 58,3) (l'expression est employée une fois mais au singulier dans les visions), «les croyants» (*οἱ πιστεύοντες*) (69,3), ou «ceux qui ont entendu le kérygme et y ont cru» (*οἱ ἀκούσαντες τοῦ κηρύγματος καὶ πιστεύσαντες εἰς αὐτόν*) (69,2). Puis, tout à coup, on trouve sans complément treize fois en douze chapitres: «ceux qui ont cru» (*οἱ πιστεύσαντες*) (96—107).

Il faut que ceux qui ont jadis étudié le vocabulaire du *Pasteur*, aient usé de méthodes de prospection fort imparfaites, ou qu'ils aient eu des préjugés bien tenaces, pour rester insensibles à des faits aussi aveuglants! La vérité, c'est qu'ils ne faisaient pas plus de différence entre des *Paraboles*, ou entre les *Visions*, qu'entre les *Préceptes*, et qu'ainsi leurs statistiques portaient sur des amalgames.

Autrement ils auraient remarqué que *βαπτίζειν* ne se rencontre que dans les *Visions*, alors que le baptême est ailleurs le sceau: *σφραγίς*, mot qui, dans les *Préceptes* et *Paraboles I-VIII* désigne aussi la marque des élus; ils auraient également vu que des mots courants comme *ποιμήν*, *ἀρετή*, *ἔντευξις*, *ἄφεσις*, *διάθολος*, *νόμος* ne se trouvent que dans telle ou telle partie du *Pasteur*.

Mais je passe, parce qu'il y a beaucoup mieux: ce que je vous ai dit des transitions vous l'a déjà laissé entendre.

Cette œuvre qui est toute entière consacrée à la pénitence, devrait largement nous transmettre l'écho des appels évangéliques où le thème de la pénitence revient si fréquemment? Eh bien, c'est loin d'être uniformément vrai.

Les *Visions* prêchent la pénitence au nom de l'Eglise, sans faire la moindre allusion au rôle du Fils de Dieu, au point que l'on peut se demander par moments si cette partie de l'œuvre est juive ou chrétienne. Faut-il noter au passage que le mot *ἐκκλησία* qui paraît désigner l'Eglise chrétienne, pourrait à la rigueur

garder le sens qu'il a dans les *Psaumes* 88^e (l'Eglise des saints) et 149^e (l'Eglise des justes), d'autant plus que le mot n'est accompagné d'aucune allusion à la fondation de l'Eglise par le Christ. C'est l'Eglise qui, telle la Sagesse dans le *Livre des Proverbes*, est la première des créatures, par qui ou en vue de laquelle le monde a été formé.

Dans la IXe *Parabole* (ce *reste* indûment rejeté vers la fin de l'ouvrage), l'Eglise ne cède pas seulement son rôle de protagoniste au Pasteur, elle se trouve dépourvée au profit du Fils de Dieu de ses prérogatives antérieures : c'est lui, le Fils bien-aimé, né avant la création toute entière, qui est le conseiller du Père et l'unique voie de salut.

Dans la Ve *Parabole*, où culmine l'enseignement christologique des *Préceptes* et des *Paraboles* I-VIII, X, il y a encore un Fils bien-aimé : c'est, non le Christ, mais l'esprit préexistant, seul Fils véritable. L'esclave, objet des complaisances divines, n'a reçu de tâche que limitée ; et si, par sa générosité au service de Dieu et de ses frères, il a mérité la plus belle des récompenses, l'adoption divine, ce n'est plus à lui que s'appliquent les textes sapientiaux : l'esprit préexistant crée et conseille.

Qu'il y ait, de l'un à l'autre de ces textes, une véritable substitution de personnes, nous est confirmé par ce fait que les six anges protoctistes (les premiers créés) (12,1) qui escortent l'Eglise dans les *Visions* (9,6), entourent le Fils dans la IXe *Parabole* (89,8), et sont précisément ceux dont Dieu prend conseil, en même que du Fils-esprit dans l'allégorie de la vigne de la Ve *Parabole* (58,3).

Ce sont là des indices entre beaucoup d'autres. Je ne vous ai cité que des exemples parmi les plus importants de ces indices : je veux dire le changement de vocabulaire qui met à part les *Visions* d'Hermas, . . . celui-ci cessant d'ailleurs complètement d'être nommé dès que le Pasteur entre en scène ; et l'opposition des doctrines christologiques qui empêche d'attribuer le *reste* (j'entends la IXe *Parabole*) à l'auteur des *Préceptes* et des autres *Paraboles*.

Sans m'arrêter davantage à vous en fournir la preuve, je voudrais vous dire comment, à mon sens, le *Pasteur* a été composé.

Il y eut d'abord un brave homme (S'appelait-il Hermas ? Ce pourrait être un nom d'emprunt ! Mais peu importe.) qui se mit en tête de prêcher la pénitence. Il n'avait aucun mandat spécial pour le faire ; peut-être cependant était-il diaire ? Il feignit de

s'être fait réprimander pour ses propres manquements; et il étendit les admonitions qu'il prétendait avoir reçues, à sa famille, à l'ensemble de la communauté dont il faisait partie, et à toute la société chrétienne. Il appartenait lui-même à un milieu judéo-chrétien (Je dis: judéo-chrétien, bien que je sois incapable de préciser si on y gardait ou non les observances), et comme l'Apollos des *Actes* parlait du Christ alors qu'il ne connaissait que le baptême de Jean, Hermas prônait la repentance sans parler du Christ. Ses *Visions* ne font aucune allusion non plus à l'enseignement d'un Pasteur.

Un second auteur s'efforça de suppléer à l'insuffisance de la christologie d'Hermas. En s'inspirant de l'évangile johannique, il mit en lumière le rôle du Fils de Dieu par qui, seul, on accède au Père. Il le fit au nom du Pasteur qui lui était apparu . . . Nous ne disons pas au nom du Bon Pasteur, car le Pasteur de la IXe *Parabole* ne s'identifie absolument pas avec le Christ qui, lui, paraît bien être le Maître de la tour dont le Pasteur n'est que l'humble serviteur . . . Si j'en avais le temps, je vous montrerais comment s'accuse cette distinction dans la IXe *Parabole*, tandis que le Pasteur des *Préceptes* et des autres *Paraboles* tend à se confondre avec le Fils adoptif qu'est le Christ!

Ce second auteur ne se donna pas le mal d'inventer une nouvelle allégorie: il reprit simplement celle de la tour qui avait déjà fait l'objet de la IIIe *Vision*: aux révélations de l'Eglise se trouvèrent donc adjointes celles du Pasteur. Ce complément est relativement discret: non seulement l'auteur s'abstient de prendre le nom de son devancier, et reçoit ses enseignements d'un autre interlocuteur divin; mais, autant qu'on en peut juger à travers les retouches des transitions, il dut se contenter d'accorder son œuvre à la précédente, sollicitant peut-être la méprise . . . , mais en évitant soigneusement tout ce qui eût pu le faire taxer de fausseté caractérisée . . . Disons que, s'il a péché, c'est par mode d'équivoque ou de restriction mentale!

Cette œuvre toutefois rencontra une opposition décidée. Comme elle était sans doute trop connue déjà pour que l'on pût songer à la supprimer, un troisième auteur entreprit de la noyer dans cet ensemble nouveau, d'inspiration judéo-chrétienne et adoptianiste, que sont les *Préceptes* et les *Paraboles I-VIII et X*: ce que nous appellerons le *pseudo-Pasteur*.

Je dis bien le *pseudo-Pasteur*, car ce troisième auteur fait tout pour tromper ses lecteurs: non seulement il prétend recevoir ses

révélations du même interlocuteur divin; mais il s'attribue explicitement l'œuvre de son devancier, et, par un certain nombre d'allusions, donne à penser qu'il est également Hermas, l'auteur des *Visions*.

Sa doctrine, il l'expose partiellement, je vous l'ai dit, sous forme de *Paraboles* . . . Il en est certes de fort belles, comme celle des deux cités, ou celle de l'orme et de la vigne qui figurent les rapports de la richesse et de la pauvreté. Mais rien dans ces *Paraboles* ne justifiait leur urgence, ni le rejet du *reste* à la fin de l'ouvrage! C'est ce qui, à nos yeux, explique l'insertion préalable des *Préceptes*, ce code de vie morale inspiré de la parénèse juive traditionnelle, mais qu'on s'efforce d'adapter aux besoins de la communauté chrétienne. L'accommodation (c'est ce qui en augmente l'intérêt) en est des plus apparentes, qu'il s'agisse de la doctrine des deux esprits, ou de la morale conjugale dont je vous dirai un mot en terminant.

Restait à donner à l'ensemble une apparence d'unité: c'est pour le faire que l'auteur composa ou compléta ces étranges transitions où l'audace et l'astuce le disputent à la maladresse.

L'ensemble de ces écrits (je ne parle évidemment pas des œuvres auxquelles nos trois auteurs firent des emprunts) s'échelonne vraisemblablement dans les deux premiers tiers du IIe siècle. Hermas a pu composer ses *Visions* sous le règne de Trajan; l'auteur de la IXe *Parabole*, disons plutôt du *Pasteur*, aura supplémenté les *Visions* sous le règne d'Antonin, et vers le pontificat du pape Pie dont il pouvait être le frère, si l'on en croit la notice du *Liber Pontificalis* (c'est à dire, vers les années 140–155); enfin les *Préceptes* et les *Paraboles* I–VIII et X auront suivi d'assez près, vers la fin du même règne d'Antonin, qui se prolonge, ai-je besoin de le dire, jusqu'à l'année 161.

Vous devinez bien cependant que, si les grandes sections du *Pasteur d'Hermas* sont nettes, et faciles à délimiter, elles laissent place à beaucoup d'approximations: maints passages ont pu être modifiés et plus ou moins transformés au cours de ces mutations! Ainsi la formule du serment que Dieu fait par son Fils, dans la seconde Vision (6,8), et qui double, à quelques lignes d'intervalle, une autre formule selon laquelle Dieu jure par sa gloire (6,4), est, de ce fait, d'autant plus suspecte qu'elle contient la seule mention du Fils dans les *Visions*; elle a fort bien pu être ajoutée par l'auteur de la IXe *Parabole*, soucieux d'amorcer son propre enseignement, en plaçant une pierre d'attente dans les révélations

d'Hermas . . . De même l'assertion selon laquelle l'esprit est le Fils, assertion démentie par toute la IXe *Parabole*, n'a pu être insérée dans le prologue de celle-ci, que par l'auteur de la Ve dont cette formule résume exactement la pensée.

Ces interpolations, et beaucoup d'autres que l'on soupçonne, nous paraissent choquantes; elles l'étaient sans doute moins en un temps où l'on n'avait, de la propriété littéraire, qu'une notion des plus vagues, et où il semblait normal qu'une littérature vivante se prêtât aux besoins de l'utilisation courante: comment aurait-on hésité à combler les lacunes de doctrines insuffisamment élaborées, et à corriger les erreurs d'un enseignement jugé aberrant?

Quoi qu'il en soit, — car la première tâche de l'historien n'est pas de porter un jugement de valeur, mais de constater les faits ou de cerner les réalités qui permettent de les établir —, le *Pasteur d'Hermas* présente une complexité où se manifeste en tout premier plan l'intervention de trois auteurs: Hermas qui relate ses *Visions*, l'auteur du *Pasteur* qui est devenu notre IXe *Parabole*, et celui du *pseudo-Pasteur*, c'est à dire des *Préceptes* et des *Paraboles I—VIII et X*.

J'en viens — troisième partie — aux perspectives qu'ouvre cette interprétation du *Pasteur d'Hermas*.

III. Perspectives ouvertes par cette interprétation du Pasteur

On se fait facilement illusion sur l'importance de ce que l'on trouve: «Mes petits sont mignons», raillait le fabuliste! . . .

Je crois pourtant, au terme de cette enquête, pouvoir avancer que le *Pasteur d'Hermas*, tel qu'il apparaît dans sa complexité, se révèle beaucoup plus riche de renseignements et d'informations qu'on ne l'estime d'ordinaire. Il l'est pour la connaissance du christianisme ancien, comme il l'est au point de vue de l'évolution des idées et des faits, et pour l'étude des formes littéraires.

Vous savez comme moi combien la première moitié du IIe siècle, encore qu'elle ne soit pas une *terra incognita*, est relativement peu connue.

Or voici une œuvre qui nous introduit d'emblée dans la vie de communautés chrétiennes, et jusqu'au sein des tensions et conflits internes qu'elle permet de saisir sur le vif. Sur la nécessité

de la repentance, toutes les voix sont d'accord : le thème est repris à satiété par tous nos auteurs. Mais la problématique dans laquelle il s'insère, est chaque fois différente : on sent que chacun fait appel à des traditions propres, et que certaines des tendances auxquelles elles répondent, sont fort éloignées les unes des autres.

On voit par ailleurs quelles préoccupations animent les fidèles et quelles questions ils se posent. Rien de plus curieux par exemple que les cas de conscience du IV^e *Précepte* au sujet du mariage, en raison des attaches possibles de cette doctrine avec la littérature de Qumrân : au mari, averti de l'infidélité de sa femme, obligation est faite de renvoyer la coupable, si du moins il n'est pas aussitôt porté remède à son infortune ; mais il lui est simultanément interdit de contracter une nouvelle union, et cela, non pas en considération des paroles de Notre-Seigneur rapportées dans l'évangile, mais à la seule exigence de la pénitence : il faut laisser à la coupable toutes possibilités de se repentir et de reprendre sa place au foyer¹.

D'une manière plus générale, on constate dans le *Pasteur*, la continuité et la diversité du judéo-christianisme jusque dans le milieu romain où il mène une lutte insidieuse et discrète, la réception de l'évangile johannique dans la IX^e *Parabole*, et l'adoptionnisme à l'œuvre dès le milieu du II^e siècle.

L'évolution des idées et des faits couvre un champ tout aussi vaste. Prenons l'exemple des fautes et des vertus : d'une partie à l'autre les listes qui en sont dressées s'enrichissent, mais témoignent aussi de leur diversité initiale.

Des *Visions* à la IX^e *Parabole*, la liste des péchés s'est singulièrement allongée : aux fautes anciennes (apostasie, blasphème, trahison des frères), s'ajoutent – non pas comme je l'ai dit malencontreusement dans mon livre, l'hypocrisie et le partage de l'âme, effectivement dénoncées dans les *Visions*, mais l'indocilité, l'arrogance, la médisance, la prévarication des diacres... Cela paraît le fruit d'une expérience prolongée. Il en est de même de l'énumération faite dans la VII^e *Parabole* où, à la place des docteurs du vice, plus proches des débauchés signalés dans les *Visions*, sont dénoncés les docteurs hétérodoxes (peut-être des gnostiques?) et leurs folles doctrines.

¹ Cf. S. Giet, Aux sources de la doctrine canonique du mariage, dans : *Etudes d'Histoire du Droit Canonique*, dédiés à Gabriel Le Bras, Paris 1965, t. II, p. 1237–1242.

Mais on ne saurait ramener ces changements à une même ligne d'évolution. Les vertus étaient sept dans les *Visions*; elles passent à douze dans la IXe *Parabole*; or, dans ce nombre, on ne trouve que cinq des précédentes. Quant à la liste qu'en donnent les *Préceptes*, elle s'éloigne encore des deux autres: on n'y reconnaît plus que quatre des termes de la IXe *Parabole*, dont deux seulement sont communs aux trois listes. Evolution, certes; mais, il faut le redire, au sein de traditions diverses et de tendances divergentes.

Combien d'autres questions sont maintenant susceptibles d'être plus ou moins éclairées à la lumière du *Pasteur!* . . . Je ne parle pas toutefois de l'institution pénitentielle; car, quoi qu'on en ait dit, il n'en est nulle part explicitement fait mention.

Le *Pasteur d'Herma*s n'est pas moins intéressant pour l'étude des formes littéraires: c'est un problème qui reste partout à l'ordre du jour; or nous avons ici un exemple de choix.

Friedrich Spitta n'était pas dans l'erreur, lorsqu'il subodorait dans le *Pasteur*, un fond juif; il avait seulement le tort de généraliser, en croyant reconnaître dans l'ensemble, une œuvre judaïque qui aurait seulement été remaniée et interpolée par une main chrétienne. Ce qui est vrai, c'est que le substrat judaïque affleure partout, sans que l'on puisse la plupart du temps identifier la source précise: il se combine à des degrés divers avec l'enseignement chrétien déjà traditionnel, et l'on surprend les efforts faits çà et là pour tirer à soi l'enseignement reçu: le Pasteur est particulièrement riche en réemplois de toutes sortes qui vont de la fidélité à la tradition jusqu'aux falsifications les plus caractérisées.

Ce n'est d'ailleurs qu'un aspect du problème; nous connaissons l'autre: cette dialectique interne qui, d'un auteur à l'autre, s'efforce de compléter ou de combattre des doctrines étrangères ou adverses.

Certes, il reste beaucoup à dire, — et à découvrir — sur le *Pasteur d'Herma*s (et d'abord son texte grec intégral¹): les résultats de l'enquête que je viens de vous exposer ne font qu'élargir le champ des investigations.

Mais je pense qu'il sera difficile (vous en jugerez) de plaider la cause de son unité.

¹ Un fragment nouveau du texte grec (110,1-3) a été récemment retrouvé et publié par Euridice Lappa-Zizicas dans les Recherches de Science religieuse 53,1 965, 251—256.

³ Cross Studia Patristica VIII

**De trois expressions: *Auprès de la tour,*
la place inférieure, et *les premiers murs*,
dans le *Pasteur d'Hermas***

S. GIET, Strasbourg

Entre autres obscurités qui intriguent le lecteur dans le *Pasteur d'Hermas*, il y a trois expressions: auprès de la tour, la place inférieure, les premiers murs, qui, en dépit – ou en raison – de leur obscurité, ont reçu parfois les interprétations les plus osées. Elles s'appliquent aux pécheurs qui n'ont pas achevé d'expier leurs fautes et qui ne trouveront plus de place soit dans les murs, si la tour est faite de pierres vivantes (c'est le cas dans la IIIe *Vision*), soit à l'intérieur de la tour elle-même, si elle est considérée comme la maison de Dieu (c'est le cas dans la IXe *Parabole*). Ils resteront alors auprès de l'édifice, à une place inférieure (on traduit souvent: dans un lieu inférieur ou plus petit), ou dans les premiers murs.

Qu'est-ce à dire? Parce que ce lieu ou cette place est en relation avec le domaine de l'ange de la pénitence, on a voulu y voir l'endroit assigné dans l'église aux fidèles repentants: le narthex; on a aussi parlé du purgatoire, des limbes . . . Sans entrer dans l'examen de ces hypothèses, je voudrais montrer ici que la complexité du *Pasteur* impose pour l'étude de ces expressions une problématique nouvelle, et que cette problématique renforce les arguments déjà connus en faveur de cette même complexité. Voyons comment se présentent les textes dans chaque partie du *Pasteur*.

Pour faire comprendre à Hermas l'urgence de la pénitence, l'Eglise, dans les *Visions*, lui donne de voir s'édifier une tour qui est un symbole d'elle-même.

Les anges apportent donc des pierres; mais certaines sont rejetées qu'on laisse aux alentours immédiats de la tour: *κύκλω τοῦ πύργου* (10,8). «Ces pierres, est-il dit, on ne les utilisait pas pour la construction» (*Ibid.*). Faut-il entendre qu'elles étaient définitivement impropre? Je ne le crois pas, car nous apprenons

peu après que les pierres inutilisées qui n'avaient pas été rejetées loin de l'édifice, représentent des pécheurs qui veulent faire pénitence et qui seront utilisés s'ils la font (13,5). Il faut cependant qu'ils se repentent vite, tandis que la tour est encore en construction: une fois qu'elle sera achevée, comment y trouveraient-ils place? «Ils seront rejettés»; «il ne leur reste qu'une chose: demeurer auprès de la tour: μόνον . . . τοῦτο ἔχοντις παρὰ τῷ πύργῳ κεῖσθαι». On attendrait: ἔχοντις; «il ne leur restera»; et c'est effectivement la leçon du manuscrit de l'Athos, confirmée par les versions latines; mais le Sinaïticus et la version éthiopienne ont: ἔχοντις. Il ne semble pas cependant que le sens soit douteux: c'est leur sort final qui sera de rester auprès de la tour.

Ces pierres qui jonchent le sol, parce qu'elles sont effritées, fêlées, mutilées, ou simplement parce qu'elles n'ont pas été taillées, représentent des fidèles à la foi imparfaite, à la conduite plus ou moins défectueuse. Ils ne peuvent être exclus du salut, quand les gentils gardent jusqu'au dernier jour la possibilité de se convertir (6,5), et quand les apostats eux-mêmes ne se perdraient que s'ils reniaient le Seigneur dans les jours à venir: «pour ceux qui l'ont renié antérieurement, le Seigneur, dans sa grande miséricorde, les a pris en pitié» (6,8). Même les pierres qui roulement loin de la tour: les pécheurs qui doutent, ceux qui ne pensent pas à se repentir, les gens qui ne se décident pas à recevoir le baptême (15,1–3), ne sont pas irrémédiablement perdus: «ils peuvent faire pénitence; lorsqu'éprouvés par la souffrance, ils auront achevé d'expier leurs fautes, ils seront délivrés pour avoir eu part à la parole de la justice . . .» (15,6).

Mais sont-ils assurés d'avoir place dans la tour? A Hermas qui le demande, l'Eglise répond: «Ils peuvent faire pénitence, mais non s'adapter dans la tour: ils s'adapteront seulement à une place plus humble: ἔχοντι . . . μετάροιαν, ἀλλὰ εἰς τοῦτον τὸν πύργον οὐ δύναται ἀρμόσσαι· ἐτέρω δὲ τόπῳ ἀρμόσσονται πολὺ ἐλάττονι» (15,5).

La répétition, dans la réponse, du mot τόπος déjà utilisé dans la question au sens de *place*, nous dissuade de lui donner un autre sens. D'ailleurs il a été dit dans l'un des chapitres précédents que, si les pécheurs tardaient à se repentir, il n'y aurait plus de place (pour eux): οὐκ ἔχοντι τόπον (13,5). On ne saurait dire qu'il n'y aurait plus de *lieu* (pour les recevoir), car il n'est nullement question de leur anéantissement!

Si l'usage existait alors d'assigner aux pénitents une place à l'entrée de l'église (ce qui resterait à prouver), il ne serait pas

exclu que l'auteur se fût inspiré de cette coutume. Toutefois l'Eglise parle ici, non de la place occupée par les pénitents, mais de celle qu'ils auront méritée par leur pénitence: ce qui est tout différent. Leur retour tardif et imparfait à Dieu, qui peut se faire sur terre, au terme des épreuves eschatologiques, ne leur permettra pas d'entrer comme partie intégrante dans la construction de la tour, trop tôt achevée pour eux. Ils n'auront qu'une place plus humble, sans doute au pied de la tour. Faut-il dire qu'ils seront incorporés dans les glacis ou dans la maçonnerie du pourtour? Contentons-nous de reprendre l'expression précédente: ils seront auprès de la tour: *παρὰ τῷ πύργῳ* (13,5).

Quand on aborde la IXe *Parabole*, on éprouve une certaine surprise à constater que ces expressions changent de forme et de sens.

D'abord les pierres — ou les pécheurs — que l'on relègue auprès de la tour, le sont, non *παρὰ τῷ πύργῳ*, mais *παρὰ τὸν πύργον* (81,8; 83,5,8; 84,1). En trois de ces cas, le changement s'explique par les règles de la grammaire: avec un verbe de mouvement l'accusatif est normal. «Déposez les pierres auprès de la tour»: *τίθετε . . . παρὰ τὸν πύργον* (81,8); C'est là que le Maître ordonne de les placer: *τεθῆται . . . παρὰ τὸν πύργον* (83,5); là encore qu'elles furent placées en effet: *ἔτεθησαν . . . παρὰ τὸν πύργον* (83,8).

Dans le quatrième cas, cependant, le changement ne s'explique plus du tout, puisqu'on parle, comme dans les *Visions*, des pierres qui gisaient auprès de la tour: *παρὰ τὸν πύργον κειμένους* (84,1). Cette leçon est celle du manuscrit de l'Athos, seul représentant ici du texte grec; et l'on sait que ce manuscrit a subi des retouches. Mais le scribe visait à une plus grande correction; et c'est lui qui a écrit dans les *Visions*: *παρὰ τῷ πύργῳ κεῖνται* (13,5).

D'autre part, cette expression qui, dans les *Visions*, s'appliquait au sort final des âmes, indique ici une simple position d'attente: les pierres qui avaient été par inadvertance remises directement aux constructeurs, sont déposées auprès de la tour pour que les vierges les fassent passer par la porte qui est le Fils (81,8); les pierres rondes sont mises auprès de la tour afin d'être taillées plus tard et placées dans la construction (83,8); même les pierres dégradées que le Maître a fait retirer des murs et dont le sort paraît momentanément compromis (83,5) sont finalement confiées au Pasteur pour que celui-ci les nettoie ou les retaille,

et leur rende leur place primitive (84,1). Ainsi l'expression a-t-elle pris un sens nouveau.

Enfin le mot *tónoç* qui, dans l'allégorie de la tour de la IIIe *Vision*, avait le sens de *place*, a désormais une double signification. Tantôt il est pris au sens de *lieu*: on rejettéra les pierres inutilisables au lieu d'où on les avait prises (81,7); on reportera les pierres qui n'avaient pas été introduites par la porte à leur propre lieu d'origine (89,4). Tantôt aussi, le mot garde le sens de *place*, mais avec une acception plus vague que dans l'allégorie précédente: on demande au Maître où prendre les pierres que l'on mettra à la place des autres: *eīç tòv tónor aὐτῶν* (83,6); on taille des blocs pour tenir la place des pierres qu'on avait enlevées (83,8); on demande cependant si les pierres retaillées pourront remplir la même place que les autres (84,5).

Toutes ces remarques n'ont pas la même importance: la principale concerne évidemment le sens de l'expression *παρὰ τὸν πύργον* qui, dans la IXe *Parabole*, ne désigne plus qu'une position d'attente, au lieu d'indiquer les sort final des âmes.

Dans les *Préceptes* et les *Paraboles* I-VIII (je ne parle pas de la Xe qui, de toute façon, est dans une certaine dépendance de la précédente), il n'est question de la tour que d'une manière allusive; et l'on est en droit de se demander à quelle allégorie l'auteur se réfère: celle de la IIIe *Vision* ou celle de la IXe *Parabole*.

A en croire l'ordre actuel des *Paraboles*, ce devrait être à la première, puisque le lecteur est censé ne rien connaître de l'autre. Pourtant l'auteur de la VIIIe *Parabole*, celle du saule, parle habituellement de la tour comme d'une demeure, ainsi que le fera celui dela IXe, mais ce qui est exceptionnel dans la IIIe *Vision*.

L'auteur de la VIIIe *Parabole* ne semble d'ailleurs pas connaître l'expression *παρὰ τῷ πύργῳ* ou *τὸν πύργον*. Il y a bien chez lui une position d'attente, comme dans la IXe *Parabole*: c'est celle des branches qui ont été coupées, et qui, desséchées ou flétries, sont replantées dans le sol afin qu'elles y retrouvent vie; mais c'est sans rapport immédiat avec la tour.

Pour désigner le sort final des pécheurs repentants, l'auteur use d'une autre expression: *eīç τὰ τείχη* ou *eīç τὰ τείχη τὰ πρῶτα*: dans les murs ou dans les premiers murs. On la trouve quatre fois, mais avec un sens différent.

Ainsi, après avoir envoyé dans la tour les hommes dont les rameaux avaient fructifié ou s'étaient seulement garnis de pou-

ses nouvelles, l'ange y envoie aussi ceux dont les rameaux étaient restés verts. Puis il dit au Pasteur: «Je m'en vais; toi, conduis ces gens dans les murs selon qu'ils en seront dignes» (68,5). «Ces murs, note M. Joly, désignent la tour elle-même». Nous le pensons comme lui.

Mais il n'en est pas de même des expressions suivantes (et ce pourrait être l'indice d'une reprise rédactionnelle de la *Parabole*). Parlant des pécheurs qui se sont repentis après de grandes fautes, le Pasteur dit: «Ils sont redevenus bons, et leur demeure a été fixée dans les premiers murs; certains même sont montés dans la tour» (72,6). Ces premiers murs ne se confondent donc pas avec la tour: ils n'en sont que les abords. De même en est-il d'un autre passage, à propos des esprits divisés trop lents à se convertir: «Ceux d'entre eux qui ont fait pénitence ont leur demeure dans la tour; mais ceux qui mettront trop longtemps à entrer dans la voie du repentir, habiteront les murs» (73,3). Enfin il y a des gens qui n'arrivent pas à se dégager des affaires temporelles par lesquelles il se sont laissé accaparer: «S'ils font vite pénitence, leur demeure sera dans la tour; s'ils tardent trop, ils habiteront (eux aussi) dans les murs» (74,3).

L'auteur de la VIII^e *Parabole* qui est seul à parler des premiers murs ou des murs, désigne vraisemblablement dans ces trois derniers cas l'enceinte extérieure de la tour, lieu de salut imparfait. Il n'est pas douteux que, pour lui, la pénitence ne produise ses effets qu'à la condition d'être prompte et durable. Ceux qui tardent, ceux qui manquent de persévérance resteront près de la tour sans y entrer.

Cette conception nous ramène, non à l'enseignement de la IX^e *Parabole*, mais à celui des *Visions* selon lequel on n'a, auprès de la tour, qu'une récompense imparfaite, et cela, bien que la tour soit considérée comme une demeure, ce qu'elle n'était pas en principe dans les mêmes *Visions*.

Mais pourquoi parler des premiers murs ou des murs? J'ai supposé dans mon livre: *Hermas et les Pasteurs* que l'auteur de la VIII^e *Parabole* avait interprété par là et essayé d'expliquer, l'une ou l'autre des expressions employées par ses devanciers: *τόπος ἐλάττων*, *παρὰ τῷ πύργῳ* ou *τὸν πύργον*. Mais ce n'est qu'une hypothèse fondée sur le fait que les *Précédentes* et les *Paraboles I-VIII et X* sont les sections les plus récemment ajoutées à l'œuvre d'*Hermas*. Toutefois comme elles sont faites en partie de morceaux plus anciens, il se pourrait que l'expression «les pre-

miers murs» fût littérairement indépendante des précédentes, et leur rencontre, fortuite.

Je me permets donc de poser une question, et de vous demander si vous l'avez rencontrée ailleurs avec une signification analogue?

De toute façon la seule image qui pourrait avoir quelque rapport avec la place assignée aux pénitents, parce que c'est une position d'attente, est celle de la IXe *Parabole*... (on ne voit toutefois aucune raison valable de lui donner une signification aussi précise). Quant aux autres: être auprès de la tour, occuper une place inférieure, d'après les *Visions*, être dans les premiers murs d'après la VIIIe *Parabole*, elles se disent des fins dernières.

Pour moi toutes ces expressions tendent simplement à maintenir les pécheurs dans l'espérance et dans le crainte, à les inciter à s'engager au plus tôt dans la voie de la repentance, tout en leur faisant redouter de n'être pas pleinement des élus. Mais elles diffèrent avec les auteurs.

Repentance in I Clement

S. G. HALL, Nottingham

1. The early Church thought of itself as the Congregation of God's people brought into existence in the last days as had been foretold in prophecy. They believed themselves to be in some sense already "saints", already possessing the Spirit of God, the mind of Christ. They had received from God the gift of a new heart, *metanoia*, and now lived as bound by the new covenant. This ideal conflicted with the empirical facts about the behaviour of members of the Church, but was maintained so far as possible. One of the consequences was that the word *metanoia* and its cognates generally denoted only the first repentance of conversion; if men should afterwards fall away, there remained no further opportunity to repent (Heb 6.4–6, etc.). This remains generally true, in spite of the fact that the Christian way as depicted in the NT is one of constant turning from sin to God, of penitence constantly renewed as faith is constantly renewed (see A. Richardson, An Introduction to the Theology of the NT, 1958, pp. 31–34). It remains generally true, also, in spite of exceptions. Hermas, with its precise casuistry of one and only one opportunity for penance and restoration in cases of post-baptismal sin, serves to confirm the general point that *metanoia* was understood as once-for-all. 2 Clement and Revelation (see 2.5,15,22; 3.3,19) may be genuine exceptions, though W. Telfer has tried to force them into the same mould as Hebrews and Hermas (The Forgiveness of Sins, 1959, chapter 2).

The main outlines of the NT conception of repentance are well brought out in Kittel TWNT *sv metanoia*. The word, which before Christ seems to mean merely "change of mind" even in the LXX, in the NT is filled with the moral force of *teshubah*, *epistrephein*, "change of heart".

I Clement is written against this background. It shows a strong sense of the status and privileges of those called to be the people of God. Clement calls upon a church and upon individuals

within it to renew their allegiance to God, to turn from sin and to plead for forgiveness. But there are limitations in his use of the word *metanoia* and cognates, and there remains the sense that the true life of the Church is ἀμεταμέλητος, undeviating. The relation between once-for-all conversion and continual penitence which Clement tries to express is, we believe, illuminating.

At 2.3 the church at peace seeks mercy, but for involuntary sins, and at 2.6 its members grieve over the sins of others which they reckon as their own. *Christiani inviti tantum peccant* writes Harnack. Significantly, the next verse contains the first occurrence of *ametameletoς* in the letter – “You were without regret (*ametameletoι*) in every act of kindness, ‘ready unto every good work’” (Lake’s Loeb translation). But “without regret” implies too passive a sense, and the Patristic Greek Lexicon rightly renders “steadfast”. Clement develops the thought further with a comprehensive description of the early Church as it saw itself: “Adorned with all-virtuous and honorable conduct, you completed all things in fear of him; the commandments and judgements of the Lord were ‘inscribed in the tablets of your hearts.’” So the thought of grief for sin, even involuntary or vicarious sin, is swiftly qualified.

It is noteworthy that after a passage in which Clement has stuck consistently to the one word *metanoia* (7.4–8.5) he draws a conclusion which contains the same thought, but not the word (9.1): “Wherefore let us obey his excellent and glorious will; let us fall before him as suppliants of his mercy and goodness; let us turn to his pity, and abandon the vain toil and strife and jealousy which leads to death.” There is perhaps a studied avoidance of the word *metanoia* – a Christian needs humility and forgiveness, but not “conversion”. Yet the whole argument would be pointless unless the substance of the exhortation were the same as the repentance just discussed.

The only place where he commends *metanoia* is 57.1, where the leaders of sedition are commanded ὑποτάγητε τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις καὶ παιδεύθητε εἰς μετάνοιαν. This follows a strong recommendation to “receive correction (*paideia*)” in 56. It is therefore reasonable to assume that a technical act of penance is here in mind – a public submission rather like the second *metanoia* envisaged in Hermas. Once again, a qualification or juxtaposition of paradox occurs. Immediately after the scriptural quotation which backs the call to repentance, we find the call to flee to God

for refuge (58.1-2), and the words “receive our counsel, and it will be *ametameleta* to you”. This may be simply the passive sense, “it will cause you no regrets”. But in the same verse the positive is demanded by the sworn promise of honour in the number of the elect to the man “who in humility with eager gentleness has ἀμεταμελήτως performed the decrees and commandments given by God”. This must mean “consistently”.

In 54, he appeals to the rebels to choose exile, if need be, for love’s sake. *ταῦτα οἱ πολιτεύμενοι τὴν ἀμεταμέλητον πολιτείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἔποιήσαν καὶ ποιήσονται*, continues Clement. Lightfoot renders the subject as “those who live as citizens of that kingdom of God which brings no regrets”, which surely misrenders *πολιτείαν*, “conduct”. The Patristic Greek Lexicon follows Lightfoot here, ignoring the close parallel with 2.7,8, where *ametameletois* was rendered rightly as “steadfast”. We would render “those who follow the consistent mode of conduct appointed by God”. It is this paradox, that one must be unrepentant in a submission to God which is essentially penitent, which we shall find to be the key to Clement’s thought about the problem.

Two incidental points are worth mentioning. First, St Paul hardly uses *metanoia*. He uses it of the conversion of the unbeliever in Ro 2.4. Otherwise, he uses it only at 2 Cor 7.8–11, where he is at pains to explain that there is a “godly grief unto repentance” (*ἔλυτήθητε εἰς μετάνοιαν*. *ἔλυτήθητε γάρ κατὰ θεόν*. cf. 1 Cle 56.1 *παιδεύθητε εἰς μετάνοιαν*). But he fences it about, just like Clement, with insistence that this does not alter the consistent status of the elect – his own conduct is consistent, *οὐ μεταβολαι*, and “godly grief *μετάνοιαν εἰς σωτηρίαν ἀμεταμέλητον ἐγράζεται*”, 7.10. Thus a proper grief for sin expresses the fundamental *metanoia* which leads to salvation, whether “unregretted” or “free from need for repentance” we need not decide. This passage has probably influenced Clement, who knew the Corinthian letters of Paul.

Secondly, western Stoicism certainly regarded change of mind as inconsistent with the moral ideal. *Non mutat sapiens consilium . . . ideo nunquam illum paenitentia subit* (Sen. Ben. IV 34.4; one of the examples in TWNT IV, p. 676 n. 14); Cicero attributes the belief to Cato *sapientem nihil opinari, nullius rei paenitere, nulla in re falli, sententiam mutare nunquam . . . pro Murenā XXIX 61*. Would it be wrong to suppose that diffused Stoicism of this kind influenced Paul and Clement?

2. Clement sees repentance as the gift of God. The Corinthians, in order to see what is pleasing to God, are called upon to “gaze on the blood of Christ, and recognize that it is precious to his Father, because it was shed for our salvation and brought out the grace of repentance (*μετανοίας γάρ οὐ ὑπῆργκεν*) to the whole

world”, 7.4. There is no reason to suppose that this means anything other than what is meant by such passages as Acts 5.31, “Him did God exalt . . . a Prince and Saviour, to give repentance unto Israel and remission of sins”, or Acts 11.18 “to the Gentiles also God hath given repentance unto life.” In Acts, as the context of 11.18 particularly reveals, the meaning of *metanoia* is the new, penitent heart infused by God through the Spirit, and it would be wrong to reduce it to the more passive sense of “chance to be forgiven”. But that is what Torrance does with Clement 7.4; at most, he writes, Clement means that God has “by an act made possible the repentance of man” (*The Doctrine of Grace in the Apostolic Fathers*, pp. 51–52). It is difficult to see, as Torrance implies, that his view is supported by 8.1; “The ministers of the grace of God through the Holy Spirit spoke of repentance”. Here “grace” and “repentance” can both bear a fully Christian sense whereby God actively recreates the hearts of men through the Spirit; though it must be admitted that the reduced sense is also possible – “The agents of God’s benevolence . . . spoke of his willingness to forgive the penitent.” The real ground for Torrance’s view is 7.5, which appears to be a parallel to 7.4; “Let us review all the generations, and learn that in generation upon generation the Master has given a place of repentance (*μετανοίας τόπον ἔδωκεν*) to those who are willing to turn to him”. Obviously this can mean merely that God has left room for people to repent, is prepared to forgive the penitent. But the conclusion should not be drawn that “the grace of repentance” in the previous sentence should be taken in this reduced sense, for two reasons. First, “grace”, *charis* is usually associated with the Christian dispensation by Clement, and seems to be used deliberately in this sense in 7.4 and 8.1. We may therefore understand more by *χάριν* in 7.4 than by *τόπον* in 7.5. Secondly, while “has given a place of repentance” may not necessarily imply more than “was willing to forgive the penitent”, it still admits of a more positive interpretation. In fact, it could quite well mean that God has actively promoted repentance in every generation. The difference between what has happened in the past and what has happened in Christ is the grace which now carries “to all the world” the repentance which in the past was limited to Nineveh or Israel. Clement, like most early churchmen, regarded the apostles as having carried the Gospel to all the world (see 5.7).

On *μετανοίας τόπον ἔδωκεν*, the biblical background is possibly Wisdom 12.10, “But judging them little by little thou didst repeatedly give a place of repentance (*ἔδιδον τόπον μετανοίας*)”. As in the passage we are considering, the meaning is ambiguous. It could be that according to Wisdom God left the door open; instead of annihilating the sinners at one blow, he went gently to give them time. But it may also mean that he went gently to give them *cause*, as in Wisd 11.23, “thou overlookest the sins of men to the end they may repent”, (cf also Ro 2.4). Heb 12.17 is a clear instance of *τόπος μετανοίας* meaning “opportunity to be forgiven” — Esau “found no place of repentance, though he sought it with tears”. There is no doubt Clement has read this; but he probably knew also Sir 4.5. “From the needy do not turn away your eye, and do not give a man occasion to curse you” — where *δῶς τόπον* can only mean “give positive occasion”, “provoke”. It is therefore linguistically possible that Clement means in 7.5 that God actively promoted repentance.

The context actually favours this interpretation. The instances of Noah and Jonah are recorded both in respect of the mission of the divine herald and the forgiveness received. But in the case of the apostles (“the ministers of the grace of God”, 8.1) there is no reference to anyone being forgiven. It appears therefore that in this case God gave the place of repentance by sending the apostles who “through the Holy Spirit spoke of repentance”, a positive act. The appeals of the Father in 8.2–4 are again ambiguous, expressing both a willingness to forgive and a call to repentance. The quotations are long and may include matter not to the point. The first begins as a version of Ezekiel 33.11f. different from the LXX (which here follows the MT closely), but tapers off into an amalgam of scriptural phrases. Clement clearly had this in a book of scripture, whether in his copy of Ezekiel or in a lost apocryphon, since he goes on afterwards “And in another place he says this . . .”, 8.4. The text runs:

The Master of all himself spoke of repentance with an oath; ‘*For as I live, said the Lord, I do not wish for the death of a sinner but his repentance*’, and he added a kind declaration, ‘*Repent, house of Israel, from your iniquity. Say to the sons of my people*, “If your sins be from the earth to the heaven, if they be redder than scarlet and blacker than sacking, and you turn to me wholeheartedly and say ‘Father’, I will listen to you as a holy people.”’

The words in italics are from Ezekiel 33.11f., some being exact quotations, others rough equivalents. The remaining words reflect

Ps 103.10ff. (102.10ff.) Jer 3.19 ff., Is 1.18, and are in sharp contrast with the precise (if benevolent) casuistry of Ezekiel's continuation in 33.12ff. In fact it appears to be a Christian compilation for three reasons: a) Clement has the characteristically Christian *metanoein* for the Hebrew *shâbh*; this never occurs in the LXX (Is 46.8 is very doubtful) which here uses *apostrephein* and *apostrophe*. b) The phrase "blacker than sack-cloth" appears to have no scriptural parallel except Rev. 6.12. c) The theological emphasis on God as Father and on the Holy People is characteristically (though not exclusively) Christian (note esp. 29.1). We are therefore entitled to read this quotation as drawing out the thought of the active grace of God creating a new, holy, family, by converting their hearts to him, rather than merely passively waiting for them to improve and ask forgiveness. The second quotation, 8.4, follows closely the LXX of Is 1.16–20. It undoubtedly includes an insistence on a change of life as the condition of forgiveness: "Wash you, make you clean . . . cease from your wickedness, learn to do good . . . judge the orphan, give sentence for the widow, and come . . .". It even adds a plain threat, "If you will not, and do not listen to me, a sword shall devour you." But paradoxically it also includes the gracious hope of personal relations restored – "come and let us reason together, says the Lord"; and the promise of divine action to cleanse from sin – "If your sins be as scarlet, I will whiten them like snow." We cannot be certain how apt Clement found the quotation, or on which element, God's benevolence or God's initiative, the emphasis fell. We conclude then that it is perfectly possible, both linguistically and in the light of the subsequent illustrations, that *μετανοίας τόπον ξδωκεν* means "provided an occasion for repentance". This interpretation should be accepted if the general pattern of Clement's thought justifies it.

3. The repentance which God gives is not merely the once-for-all conversion at the beginning of the Christian life, but a continuing spiritual process. Repentance is in substance to be worked out in the prayers and good works of the Church even in its best state, and not merely in relation to the current schism at Corinth. But it is true that Clement does not use *metanoia* and its cognates in this context.

We take up the argument at 8.5–9.1, where Clement sums up the argument of the preceding illustrations from scripture and church history, and then applies the point to his readers.

"Thus intending that all his beloved should share in repentance, he established them in his almighty purpose. Therefore let us obey his magnificent and glorious will, and, becoming suppliants of his mercy and goodness, let us cast ourselves down and turn to his pitifulness, forsaking vain toil and strife and the envy which leads to death."

Clement's verbosity does not help the exegete. But it is quite clear that *all* God's elect need repentance; indeed, if our translation of 8.5 is correct, the whole purpose of their election is to bless them with its benefits. It is clear, secondly, that repentance is part of that submission to the divine *Despotes* which is characteristic of Clement's thought about man's relation to God. Thirdly, that repentance consists in turning to God and turning from sin, in that order. Fourthly, as we have already noted, Clement does not use *metanoia* in this context, because he is recalling the Church to its constant duty, not to a particular change of heart; since he is going straight on to illustrate the point with men as righteous as Enoch and Noah, he could hardly do so.

Most commentators and translators assume a different object for ἐστήριξεν in 8.5. Lake is typical: "Thus desiring to give to all his beloved a share in repentance, he established it by his almighty will" (Loeb edition). The Greek runs: πάντας οὐν τοὺς δύαπτηρος αὐτοῦ βουλόμενος μετασχεῖν ἐστήριξεν τῷ παντοκρατορικῷ βουλήματι αὐτοῦ. There is no true biblical parallel for στηρίζειν with so abstract an object as μετάνοια; the nearest is perhaps 1 Macc 2.49, νῦν ἐστηρίχθη ὑπερηφανία, but even there the abstract really has a concrete signification, "the proud". It would be possible (cf. Liddell and Scott s. v. B. II) to take στηρίζειν as intransitive, meaning something like "he settled in his almighty purpose". But the most natural course is to assume that τοὺς δύαπτηρος does duty as object of both βουλόμενος and ἐστήριξεν. In the LXX στηρίζειν has more often than not a person (or a person's heart or mind) as object of the active or subject of the passive. In the NT the verb occurs eleven times with this personal use, mostly in the epistles, once with πρόσωπον as object (Luke 9.51), and once with an impersonal concrete object. Clement follows the biblical pattern — a personal object at 13.3 and 18.12 (in citation), impersonal concrete object at 33.3, and in passive with ή διάριου ημῶν as subject in 35.5. The consequence of such an interpretation is to give the sentence a predestinarian flavour which is not in keeping with what most critics expect from Clement. But such a doctrine clearly lies behind the words of his opening address, and the prayer of 59.1f. It obviously supports the general understanding of *metanoia* which we have found in 7–9.

Clement illustrates his plea for penitence by an appeal to instances of obedience in the OT. There is much irrelevant matter in 9–19, but the emphasis clearly falls on submission to the will of God. This is the meaning of "faith" in the cases of Abraham and Rahab (10 and 12), as we see from 10.1 "Abraham . . . was found faithful by this obedience to the words of

God". It is also the meaning of *eusebeia* in the case of Lot, 11.1. The general conclusion is drawn that we ought "to be obedient to God" rather than to leaders of schism, 14.1. This involves joining the humble, the *tapeinophronountes*, of whom Clement gives a series of instances in 16–18. He concludes this section in 19.1, and leads on to his next section with the words:

"The humility and obedient submission of so many men of such great fame have made better not only us but the generations before us, those who have received his oracles in fear and truth."

It is clear, then, that whatever digressions occur, the basic thought is obedience. But this does not mean that the digressions are irrelevant; sometimes they serve to illustrate what Clement thinks his main theme implies. In 9.4 he cannot help reflecting upon the concord, *homonoia*, which must have prevailed in Noah's ark, although his object is to stress Noah's obedience as a preacher; the Corinthian Church must remember concord (Clement thinks) if it is to be saved. A similar irrelevance, but one which has greater consequence, is the coupling of hospitality, *philoxenia*, with faith or piety at 10.7; 11.1, and 12.1; the connection is here more direct and logical, for Clement believes that there is no salvation except for the man who humbly sets others above self, which is the core of hospitality. This point emerges again in 13, where Clement recommends the Corinthians to adopt humility and set aside arrogance, on the basis of Jer 9.23–24 (LXX 9.22–23). He then continues:

"... especially remembering the words of the Lord Jesus which he spoke while teaching gentleness and patience. He said this: 'Be merciful, that you may obtain mercy. Forgive, so that you may be forgiven. As you give, it shall be given you. As you judge, you will be judged. As you are kind, you will receive kindness. The measure you use will be used for you.'

In 14 and 15 Clement goes on to argue that they must "be kind to one another" and not support the schismatics; one cannot do both. We shall see later how fundamental is the thought to Clement that none can come to God if he denies his brother.

In 9–12 Clement tells of the heroes of obedience. In 16–18 he gives examples of humility, with Christ himself at the head of the list. In at least two cases, Job (17.3–4) and David (who is quoted at length in 18), their testimony specifically includes the acknowledgement of sinfulness before God. In the case of Christ, it consists principally of Is 53, in which the servant of God is depicted as weak and suffering, but also repeatedly described as

dearing the consequences of the sin of others. It is fair, therefore, to deduce from these passages that Clement regards the penitent approach to God as the mark of the Church at all times, and not merely at times of strife and apostasy; since it is the mark of the great and holy men of old, and of Christ himself. In the case of Christ such penitence can only be vicarious; in the case of the others it may also be in part vicarious. We shall see that he explicitly regards corporate or vicarious penitence as part of the Church's proper approach to God.

It is often assumed (as by M. D. Hooker in "Jesus and the Servant", pp. 130 and 133) that in quoting Isaiah 53 Clement ignores the element of vicarious sin-bearing, and is merely interested in the example of his humble submissiveness. It is true that *tapeinophronein* is the sole positive point of comparison that Clement draws. But once we recognize that for Clement humility implies corporate penitence, and voluntary suffering for the community, the conclusion does not so clearly follow.

We have indicated passages which appear to imply that for Clement the Church is in an attitude of penitence even in its proper and peaceful state. The clearest evidence we have left till last. It consists of three passages, 2.3–8, 35.5, and 60.1–2. 2.3–8 speaks for itself:

"You were full of holy designs, and in zeal for good you stretched out your hands with pious confidence to almighty God, imploring him to be merciful towards any involuntary sin. You strove day and night on behalf of the whole brotherhood, that the number of his elect might be saved with pity and conscience (?). You were sincere and pure and bore no malice to each other. All sedition and schism you abhorred. Over the transgressions of your neighbours you used to grieve; you used to reckon their shortcomings your own. You were steadfast in every act of kindness, 'ready unto every good work'. Adorned with all-virtuous and honorable conduct, you completed all things in fear of him; the commandments and judgements of the Lord were 'inscribed in the tablets of your hearts.'"

35.5 is not so clearly a case of continuing penitence in the Church. But it is set in a context that deals with the standing of the Church in general, the gifts it has received from God, and its consequent duty of good works. In 35.1–4 Clement urges God's gifts and the need to be found among those who wait for him:

"But how shall this be, beloved? — If our mind is fixed faithfully upon God; if we seek what is pleasing and acceptable to him; if we complete what fits his faultless will, and follow the way of truth, casting from us all iniquity and evil, greed, strife, malice and fraud, gossip and slander, hate of God, pride and arrogance, vanity and inhospitality (?)."

Clement goes on to quote at length from Ps 50 (LXX 49) on the punishment awaiting those who pay God lip-service, but break

his laws. We have translated the aorist participle *ἀπορρίψατες* as “casting (from)”. It could, of course, mean “having set aside once and for all”, and for this reason the passage does not conclusively support our argument. Our final passage is the general confession from the great liturgical prayer of 59–61; the Creator, faithful, righteous and wise, merciful and compassionate, is asked (60.1–2) :

“... forgive us our iniquities and sins and transgressions and failures. Do not count every sin of your servants and maids, but cleanse us with the cleansing of your truth, and guide our steps to walk in holiness of heart ...”

W. Telfer (The Forgiveness of Sins, p. 27) regards this as a “humble acknowledgement of frailty based upon a recollection of prebaptismal sins”. We hope we have shown sufficient reason for disagreeing.

4. Penitence, then, if not *metanoia*, is the continuing mark of the Church. Our next point is that it is available to all. Clement appears to draw no line at which forgiveness is no longer possible if a person repents. The principal evidence for this is what he writes to the members of the schismatic group he wishes to win over, and in particular to its leaders. It may well need qualifying, for our evidence is far from complete. There is, for instance, no evidence about Clement’s attitude to other sins than schism – apostasy, murder, or adultery could have caused him to be more rigorous.

This is actually unlikely, since he appears in 3–6 to regard sins such as fratricide and persecution as manifestations of the same destructive envy, *zelos*, which divides the Corinthians. And one may feel that his attitude generally would err on the side of patience rather than rigour. But these considerations are hardly conclusive. A further qualification must also be stated. Clement may regard some people as predestined to perdition. In 59.1–2, after his great appeal to the schismatic leaders, he warns them that to persist in disobedience will involve them in great danger,

“... but we shall be innocent of this sin, and will ask with earnest prayer and supplication that the Creator of all will guard intact the number of his elect that has been counted in all the world through his beloved Servant Jesus Christ, through whom he called us from darkness into light ...”

Clement, like the writer of 1 Jo 5.16, does not pray for the damned. But one can believe in predestination without believing that one can identify the reprobate; and Clement never himself shuts the door to the penitent.

⁴ Cross, *Studia Patristica VIII*

It is hardly necessary to demonstrate that Clement regards forgiveness as readily available to the Church and its members who have followed the schismatic leaders. It is the repeated burden of his appeals as at 9.1, 13.1, 48.1, 51.1. God stands ready to receive the penitent:

"The all-merciful and beneficent Father has compassion on those who fear him, and kindly and lovingly bestows his favours on those who approach him with a simple mind." (23.1)

All that is needed is obedience now to God's command:

"It is therefore right that we should respect so many and so great examples and bow the neck, and take up the position of obedience, so that ceasing from vain sedition we may gain without any fault the goal set before us in truth." (63.1)

"He asks nothing of anyone, save that confession be made to him" (52.1)

The case of the leaders, the "few reckless and rash persons" (1.1), "those who in pride and confusion are captains of foul jealousy" (14.1), is more extreme and more interesting. There is no question of their ultimate doom if they persist in sin; they involve themselves in great danger (59.1), they face the "judgements to come" (28.1), they come under the Woe pronounced by Jesus upon those who offend his elect (46.8). They may also be exiled from the Church of Corinth:

"Who then among you is noble, who is compassionate, who filled with love? Let him say 'If sedition and strife and schisms are due to me, I will leave, I will go where you like, and I will do as the majority commands; only let the flock of Christ have peace with its established presbyters'." (54.1-2)

Such conduct, however, is certainly not catholic excommunication, as the next verse shows:

"He who does this will win himself great fame in Christ, and every place will receive him for 'The earth is the Lord's and the fulness of it'."

For these leaders forgiveness and salvation are possible, but the way may be costly. Obviously, it will entail the laying down of prerogatives usurped from the lawful clergy, "for it is better for you to be found small and reputable in the flock of Christ, than of outstanding reputation but expelled from hope in him" (57.2). It will certainly entail some penance, which may include the exile, temporary or permanent, to which we have already referred. This is clearly implied by the language of 57.1:

"You therefore who laid the foundation of the sedition, submit to the presbyters, and receive correction for *metanoia*, bending the knees of your

hearts. Learn to submit, putting aside the boastful and haughty rashness of your tongue . . .”.

But this is not the heart of the matter. The fundamental condition for restoration is that the leaders should be “found in love”. Like Moses, who offered his own life to win forgiveness for Israel (53), like heathen kings who sacrificed themselves for their subjects, and women of the Bible who risked themselves to save the people (55), they should be “filled with love” (54.1) and then they will be living the truly Christian life (54.4). Love in God and man is highly praised, as the “secret chamber” in which the elect shelter from the overwhelming storm of the impending judgement (50.3–6). It is through the divine love in Christ’s sacrifice that sinners are saved (49.6), and it is love that lifts men up high, and binds them to God (49.4–5); thus it covers a multitude of sins (49.5, cf. 50.5). Such love will include obedience and submission (49.1); it is also wholly the gift of God (50.2, cf 50.5–7). Accordingly, the faithful are to pray for the submission of sinners:

“Let us then intercede for those who have fallen into any transgression, that meekness and humility may be given them, so that they may submit, not to us, but to God’s will; thus their compassionate memorial before God and the Holy Ones will be fruitful and complete (56.1).”

These sinners include the leaders of the schism, as can be seen from the “therefore” which connects 57.1 with the preceding paragraph. They are themselves retained within the fellowship of loving intercession, and are not regarded as outside the prayer for the preservation of the Elect (59.2, already quoted). Indeed, Clement slips readily from “Let us then intercede” in 56.1 to “Let us receive correction (*παιδείαν*)” in 56.2, because “us” includes both the Church at prayer and her fallen members. It is quite possible, therefore, for the schismatic leaders to put the good of the brotherhood first, and be assured of salvation:

“Let us then pray that for our transgressions, and for what we have done through the Adversary’s assaults, we may be forgiven. And even those who were the leaders of sedition and strife ought to consider the common hope (*τὸ κοινὸν τῆς ἀληθίδος*). For those who live in fear and love allow themselves to suffer rather than their neighbours, and condemn themselves rather than our noble and righteous tradition of harmony. For it is good for a man to confess his sins and not harden his heart, as the heart of those men who rebelled against God’s servant Moses was hardened; their judgement was made plain, for they went down living to Hades, and death will rule them. (51.1–4)

Thus the appeal which the penitent Church must make to God is for a general restoration of brotherly love, *philadelphia*:

"Let us stop this (sc. *stasis*) quickly, and fall down before the Master and implore him with tears to have mercy and be reconciled to us and to restore us again to our noble and pure practice of brotherly love. For this is the gate of righteousness which opens on to life, as it is written . . . Many gates are open, but the one that is in righteousness is this — the one in Christ —, and happy are all those who have entered and direct their course in holiness and righteousness, completing all things serenely. A man may be faithful, he may be able to expound knowledge, he may be wise in distinguishing words, he may be chaste in deeds; he ought to be the more humble because he seems to be so much greater, and to seek the common good of all, and not his own." (48.1—6)

Thus *philadelphia* is the means of justification, the way of righteousness in Christ, and Clement is ready for those praises of love in 50 and 51 which we have already mentioned. We can sum up Clement's doctrine of the forgiveness of even the greatest sin through humble love in his own words:

"Blessed are we, beloved, if we were doing the commandments of God in the concord of love, that through love our sins may be forgiven." (50.5)

The sentence in 56, "Thus their compassionate memorial before God and the Holy Ones will be fruitful and complete" is perhaps best paraphrased as follows: "Thus (if we pray that sinners may be given humility and submissiveness to God) the prayer offered before God and the angels will be effective and thorough". This would imply that intercession without the request for humility and submissiveness is ineffective and incomplete. But several of the Greek words are ambiguous.

Telfer (p. 27) refers to 51.3 "It is good for a man to confess his sins and not harden his heart" as not implying more than a recollection of pre-baptismal sins. In the context, where the "leaders of sedition" are singled out (51.1) this remark is obviously wrong.

We conclude therefore that Clement envisages forgiveness as available not only to the participants but to the leaders of the schism. They may suffer temporal penalties of penance or exile, and must submit themselves to the lawful clergy. But the supreme condition is that they should love their brothers, and put the interests of Christ's flock above their own; such love, in them, in Clement, and in the faithful, covers the multitude of sins.

5. It is possible to draw some general conclusions from our study. First, Clement regards repentance as in some sense the continuous work of the Church on earth. He refrains from using *metanoia* in this connection, he undoubtedly has a very high view of the calling and status of the Church (though we have not been able to detail the evidence for this), and he regards her proper life as in some sense serene and unwavering. But members of the Church, like the righteous of old and Christ himself, come to the Father humble and submissive, seeking pardon for them-

selves and each other, and the gift of penitence for those among them who have sinned seriously. It is in fact in such submission to God's will in repentance that the Church is unswerving. Such an understanding of repentance is in keeping with the fundamental insights of the NT itself.

Secondly, as in the NT, repentance and its concomitant love are wholly the gift of God : "the grace of repentance" is a concept to be taken seriously. Clement does not at this point relapse into Judaism.

Thirdly, Clement is quite clear that there is no possibility of reconciliation with God except for those who are given grace to love their fellows. He would take seriously the familiar petition "Forgive us our debts, as we have also forgiven our debtors". He has been criticised for diluting the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith, or of failing to understand it. In fact, he seems to believe in justification by love (see especially 48); he explicitly denies that justification by faith alone implies that men should be "slothful in well-doing and cease from love" (32.3–33.1). Paul himself would probably have agreed, if he meant what he wrote in 1 Co 13.13 and Gal 5.6. Certainly the authors of the Epistle of James and 1 John would have agreed in rebuking a claim to believe in God, to love him or to know him, while disowning a brother in need; they might well have approved the coupling of faith with such ideas as "hospitality". For Clement, undoubtedly, the thought is central. It appears in passages and themes we have touched upon lightly or not at all – envy as the root sin (3–6), concord as the mark of the Universe and of the Church (20, 9.4, 60.4), and perhaps his doctrine of Church Order (40–44). If a man does not love his brother, he is lost; the beginning of hope comes when he prays that God will be reconciled to him and give him love of the brethren (48.1).

We do not know the nature of the schism against which Clement fought at Corinth. It may well have been a rigorist or particularist group like that envisaged in 1 John. Whatever it is, the weight of Clement's argument is against those who at any time or place regard themselves as marked off from other men, or from their brothers and fathers in Christ, by singular gifts of knowledge or piety. The part of the sincere believer is to bear the burdens of the weak, to grieve over his neighbours' sins as if they were his own, just as Christ was humble-minded and bore the sin of many. Even a great sin of schism will yield eventually to that kind of love.

An Argument from the Chinese for the Antiochene Origin of the *Didache*

JOAN HAZELDEN WALKER, London

Père Jean-Paul Audet, writing in 1958, accepted the probability of Syrian Antioch as the original home of the *Didache*¹. The evidence of a seventh-century Chinese version of the Two-Ways, found in chapters one to six of the *Didache*, may perhaps provide another argument in favour of Antioch.

This Chinese version is in a manuscript written shortly after the arrival of the Nestorian mission to China in the year 635. Some thirty or more Nestorian manuals were translated into Chinese during the seventh and eighth centuries. Of these, the originals of nine are extant in six manuscripts housed in China, Japan and Paris. They were all discovered in China during the twentieth century. Together with the more widely known Nestorian Monument, set up in the year 781, other archaeological relics and the few references in Chinese official records, they give the only authenticated history of Christianity in China before the later middle ages.

The seventh-century documents came into the possession of two Japanese scholars, Mr. Tomioka and Dr. Takakusu in 1916 and 1922. With the other surviving manuscripts, relics, etc., they were translated into English and made the subject of a detailed study by Professor P. Yoshio Saeki, first in 1937 and, with the addition of further discoveries of 1947, were re-issued in 1951². It is largely from his translation, together with the help of the scholarly criticism of Professor Arthur C. Moule³, that the

¹ La Didaché: Instructions des apôtres, Paris 1958, 208 ff.

² The Nestorian documents and relics in China, Tokyo 1937; 2nd revised ed., Tokyo 1951. See also his Catalogue of the Nestorian literature and relics, Tokyo 1950, which gives a comprehensive bibliography.

³ Nestorians in China: Some corrections and additions, in Sinological Series 1, London 1940; and Christians in China before the year 1550, London 1930.

following observations are made. My attention was drawn to the importance of the seventh-century Nestorian documents for both biblical and patristic studies by a young student of mine, Miss Hazel Goodey¹. We, hampered by a total ignorance of Chinese, hope that such general observations as we have been able to make may interest a specialist to pursue this possibly fruitful line of enquiry.

How, when and through whom Christianity first reached China before the advent of the Nestorian mission under bishop Alopen in 635, or some fifty years earlier with the immigrant ancestors of Mar Sergius, is a matter of legend and vague patristic references. The apostle Thomas has been credited with the gift of the gospel to the Chinese. This legend has its strong roots along with its equally strong adherents in the Syrian Orthodox Church of South India. The only certain mention of the Chinese in connection with St Thomas is, according to Professor Moule, that given by Ebedjesus in the year 1291². Probably the most important argument against the tradition, although one from silence, which to my knowledge has so far escaped notice, is to be found in a manuscript probably dating from the year 800. Discovered by Professor Paul Pelliot in 1908, in a stone cave which had been sealed since the year 1036, this Christian roll is actually a liturgical document with a historical note³. After a faithful version of the Syriac *Gloria in excelsis* there follows a litany which invokes not only many of the apostles but also a considerable number of Old Testament worthies. Yet, this litany omits the name of the supposedly apostolic bearer of the gospel to the Chinese – St. Thomas!

However, there is little doubt that Christianity must have gone far eastwards before the advent of Nestorius in the fifth century. The connection between China and the West was that of the silk trade. The silk-worm of China was known to Aristotle, incorrectly described by Virgil, while Justus Lipsius says that the use of silk in Rome began only with the age of Julius Caesar. Pliny adds the comment that the economists of his day criticised this new

¹ The early years of the Church in China. Special study in Divinity submitted for the London University Institute of Education Teachers' Certificate, 1960.

² Christians in China, 10ff.

³ Saeki, Nestorian documents, 5, 253, 273–280; Moule, Christians in China, 52ff.

feminine luxury¹. At the beginning of the Christian era trade with the West was on the increase, so much so that, by the end of the first century, the Chinese planned a diplomatic mission to the only part of the Roman empire known to them, Syria, in the hope of establishing direct relations with the West. The silk route terminated in Antioch, known to the Chinese as An-tun and which, for them, was the furthermost limit of their horizon. Recording the arrival of western merchants in their capital in the year 166, they describe them as ambassadors of the reigning Roman emperor, Marcus Aurelius of An-tun.

Antioch itself was the very heart of Christian missionary activity both to the East and the West, even before St Paul made it his headquarters. From Antioch Christianity established itself in Edessa at a very early stage. This city lay on the caravan route to the Far-East and was of strategic importance for the spread of Christianity eastwards. Incidentally, it is at Edessa that the Acts of St Thomas, which record the adventures of the apostle as far as India, were written. Here, too, the gospels were first translated into Syriac during the second century. Syriac became the literary language of the eastern branch of Christianity and was still used by Nestorians when in China. The Nestorian Monument, for example, is inscribed in both Syriac and Chinese². The historical note in the Pelliot manuscript, cited earlier, also refers to the 'five hundred and thirty scriptures' belonging to the 'Religion of the Western Lands' which were written 'on parchment in Syriac'³.

The scattered patristic references indicate at least the belief that the gospel was preached far beyond Edessa, through Persia and to the lands beyond⁴. Persia itself was hostile to the Roman empire and, in the days of persecution, no doubt, gave political asylum to Christians who fled beyond the jurisdiction of Rome. This friendly attitude is clearly seen with the arrival of the Nestorians in the fifth century.

Nestorius, himself of Persian extraction, had been a monk at Antioch. His banishment after the council of Ephesus in 431 brought persecution to his supporters, who were already established in Edessa. When they fled to Persia, they found a welcome in

¹ For these and the following details on the early history of Christianity in China, see J. Foster, *The Church of the T'ang dynasty*, London 1939, 3ff.

² Saeki, *Nestorian documents*, 68 ff.; Foster, op. cit., 134 ff.

³ Nestorian documents, 254; Christians in China, 57.

⁴ Nestorian documents, 14; Foster, op. cit., 6 ff.

political circles, but the church there was still controlled by the patriarchate of Antioch. It was not until the closing year of that century that the Nestorian element became sufficiently dominant to sever this connection. From then onwards, free from the control of imperial Christianity, the Nestorian church expanded rapidly, no doubt absorbing Christian communities already established along its path. In this way, Nestorian families penetrated the Chinese frontiers, and the official mission to China under bishop Alopen took place in the year 635.

However vague the details, the fact remains that this eastern branch of Christianity emanated from Antioch in the first century. It would have brought with it such written records as were then available in the mother church. What was more natural than its conservative use of these, even though more and, no doubt, better written documents became increasingly available? It is not surprising, therefore, that the earliest documents from China are so indebted to a version of St Matthew's gospel and to the Two-Way method of the *Didache*.

Called by Professor Saeki the Bishop Alopen documents¹, they are distinguished by the names of their Japanese purchasers. The Tomioka manuscript, actually stating itself to be written six hundred and forty-one years after the birth of Christ, consists of three incomplete and possibly misarranged tracts on Christian doctrine and practice, the last entitled 'Concerning the world-honoured One's almsgiving' and called by Saeki the 'Discourse on almsgiving'². The Takakusu one, perhaps slightly earlier, has a version of the Two-Ways and is called the 'Book of the Messiah'³. This work reveals many similarities to the *Didache*, a fact to which Professor Saeki himself drew attention. However, there are also many interesting differences which are equally suggestive.

Of the thirty-one verses which could be said to outline the Two-Ways almost all correspond to the respective passages in the *Didache*⁴. The author of the latter introduces his catechism with the phrase: 'Two ways there are, one of life and one of death. There is a great difference between the two ways'. The writer of

¹ Nestorian documents, 113 ff.

² Nestorian documents, 161–247. Foster, op. cit., 45 f., 152, accepts Saeki's view that these are three different documents, whereas Moule, Nestorians in China, 13 ff., believes them to be three incomplete sections of one treatise.

³ Translation in Nestorian documents, 125–160.

⁴ Bk. Mes., vv. 69, 103–34.

the Chinese manual states simply, 'These short views may well teach all people what is good and what is evil'¹. An echo of the negative form of the Golden Rule, found in the *Didache* in contrast to the Matthaean version of our Lord's precept, is found in the phrase 'those who have received the precepts should not hate others nor hold evil against them.'² The Chinese Two-Ways, however, remains faithful to the scheme of the Ten Commandments and suggests that it is closer than the *Didache* to the Jewish form, which Audet believes was adapted from Jewish proselyte instruction.³ A comparison of the Chinese version with that of the Qumran manual of discipline reveals the same emphasis on humility, compassion, just judgement, purity, abhorrence of idolatry and correct behaviour to others⁴.

Père Audet's arguments that the original title of chapters one to six of the *Didache* is, in fact, Jewish, — 'The instruction of the Lord, i. e. Jahweh, to the Gentiles'⁵, — has its counterpart in the first verse of the 'Book of the Messiah' which runs: 'At that time, preaching the laws of Jahweh, who is the Lord of heaven, the Messiah spoke thus'⁶.

Apart from the thirty-one verses which cover many of the points in chapters one to six of the *Didache*, both Tomioka and Takakusu manuscripts have several references to the Two Ways — the heaven way and the hell way. The 'Discourse on almsgiving', for example, makes repeated reference⁷. Where the *Didache* begins its way of death with the following: 'The way of death is this . . . it is wicked and altogether accursed, murders, etc. . . . idolatries, magical arts, sorceries . . .', the 'Discourse on almsgiving' has 'If there are any who go astray from the heaven way . . . who give themselves up to the worship of the sun and the stars and even the fire-gods'⁸. All the various parallels with the *Didache* underline the fact that Nestorian missionaries were steeped in this tradition of instruction.

¹ Did., cap. 1, 2; Bk. Mes., v. 69.

² Did., cap., 1,2; Matt., 7,12; Bk. Mes., v. 105.

³ Op. cit., 209; see also his article, *Affinités littéraires et doctrinales du Manuel de discipline* in *Revue biblique* 59, 1952, 219 ff., and 60, 1953, 45 ff.

⁴ Text in Audet, loc. cit., 219 ff.

⁵ Op. cit., 101.

⁶ Bk. Mes., v. 1.

⁷ See vv. 57, 239, 241, 244, etc.

⁸ Did., cap. 5,1; Dis. alms., v. 244.

Père Audet has demonstrated the dependence of the *Didache* on St Matthew but in a form which he believes to be earlier than the canonical gospel¹. This leads him to propose the hypothesis that the apostolic author of the *Didache* used an Aramaic version of Matthew, thus making sense of the statement of Papias who claimed on apostolic authority that 'Matthew wrote the sayings of the Lord in the Hebrew tongue'². Audet also accepts the view that both the Greek and Aramaic versions originated in Antioch³.

The Chinese manuscripts under discussion contain a short biography of our Lord, which, apart from being the earliest extant version of any part of the Bible in Chinese, is almost entirely extracted from St Matthew, even though their authors indicate a knowledge of both Johannine and Lucan material⁴. What is perhaps the most startling feature of these biographies is their use of some of the material which, on the 'Four Document Hypothesis', has been designated as Matthew's special source, namely the star at Bethlehem, Pilate's handwashing, the tearing of the temple veil, the resurrection of the dead from their graves at the crucifixion, the sealing of Joseph's tomb with the setting of the guard and its subsequent bribery⁵. These are the highlights of the Chinese 'life of Christ'.

The 'Discourse on almsgiving', moreover, follows closely the sermon on the mount⁶ and, with the *Didache*, gives the three-fold baptismal formula in its Matthaean wording: 'Preach ye my words to all races of mankind. And when they come forward to water, mark them in the name of the Father, and the Son and the Holy Wind, and make them decide to observe completely what was taught by me, for I shall be with you even to the end of the world'⁷. Again with the *Didache* and St Matthew, the warning is repeated that one should not give sacred things to the dogs⁸.

These are but a few observations which are evoked by a text comparison. Without a knowledge of Chinese, however, scientific textual criticism is impossible.

¹ Op. cit., 166 ff.

² Op. cit., 208 ff.

³ Op. cit., 208.

⁴ Bk. Mes., vv. 147–206; Dis. alms., vv. 106–49.

⁵ The Nestorian Monument also makes mention of the star; see Nestorian documents, 55; Foster, op. cit., 136, v. 40.

⁶ Verses 2–62 cover Matthew cap. 6 and 7.

⁷ Did., cap. 7, 2,3; Matt., 28,19–20 Dis. alms., v. 146.

⁸ Did., cap. 9,5; Matt., 7,6; Dis. alms., v. 34.

As the two manuscripts, although contemporary or near contemporary¹, were written by different authors, even though instigated by bishop Alopen himself, one conclusion remains inescapable. The first Nestorian missionaries to China compiled manuals of instruction for their hearers which must have followed along lines fundamental to their Christian education, namely the use of a two-way method of catechism and a very traditional selection of material from St. Matthew. That this 'tradition' originated in Antioch in the earliest years of the Christian church certainly presents itself as a working hypothesis.

¹ For the dating of these manuscripts see Saeki, *Nestorian documents*, 115 ff.; Moule, *Nestorians in China*, 13 f.; Foster, op. cit., 46 f.

VI. HISTORICA

E. BAMMEL

A. HAMMAN

B. P. W. S. HUNT

N. Q. KING

J. M. LEROUX

C. RIGGI

I. P. SHELDON-WILLIAMS

L. J. VAN DER LOF

F. E. VOKEYS

R. E. WITT

Die Täufertraditionen bei Justin

E. BÄMMEL, Cambridge

Die Täuferstellen bei Justin sind singulär; schon das macht sie bemerkenswert. Abgesehen von einer schematischen und vielleicht nicht einmal ursprünglichen Erwähnung des Johannes im ignatianischen Corpus¹ fehlt jeder Bezug auf den Täufer bei den Apostolischen Vätern. Die Apologeten – wie einheitlich in ihrer Struktur ist diese Literatur! – schweigen sich völlig über Johannes aus mit Ausnahme eben von Justin. Und auch sonst wird bis ins dritte Jahrhundert hinein der Täufer viel seltener bemüht als Thomas und Jakobus, weniger genannt selbst als Pilatus und Herodes. Von da ab gibt es eine Fülle von Nachrichten. Es sind in der Masse Ausmalungen der evangelischen Perikopen, von denen sich doch je und dann eigenständige Einzelzüge oder gar Berichte abheben. Wo steht Justin in diesem Kräftefeld?

Mehrfach spricht Justin in seinen Gesprächen mit Trypho vom Täufer und der Taufe Jesu, aber die Hauptaussagen stehen in Kapitel 88. Der Abschnitt besteht deutlich aus zwei Teilen (§§ 1–6 und 7–8). Auffallend ist, daß eine Reihe von Aussagen sich in den Partien des *einen* Kapitels wiederholen: *Iωάννης ἐβάπτισε* (§ 3) – *κηρύσσαντος βάπτισμα* (§ 7), *κατελθόντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ* (§ 3) – *ἐλθόντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ* (§ 8), *ώς περιστεράν τὸ ἄγιον πνεῦμα ἐπιπτῆναι* (§ 3) – *τὸ πνεῦμα οὐν τὸ ἄγιον . . . ἐν εἰδει περιστερᾶς ἐπέπη αὐτῷ* (§ 8), während andere Notizen nicht nur sich nicht wiederholen sondern durchaus einmalig sind. Dazu gehört im ersten Teil die Mitteilung, daß Johannes selbst *τὴν τοῦ βαπτίσματος ὁδὸν προιών* sowie die Feuererscheinung bei der Taufe Jesu. Im zweiten Teil sind es die Einzelzüge: *καθιζόμενος*, die Form der Ablehnung der eigenen Messianität², der Ankündigung des

¹ Smyrn 1,2.

² S. W. Bousset, *Die Evangelienstudien Justins des Märtyrers* 1891, S. 66.

*ἰσχυρότερος*¹ sowie die adoptianische Taufstimme. Da sich das *προιών* als Schematismus der Justinschen Theologie erklären läßt², schrumpft das singuläre Gut in der ersten Passage auf das *πῦρ ἀνήρθη* zusammen, eine Angabe, deren Herkunft von Justin, jedenfalls möglicherweise, von der der anderen Nachrichten abgehoben wird³. Dem entspricht es, daß der erste Teil eigentlich eine mit historischen Einzelnachrichten angereicherte christologische Diatribe ist.

Ganz anders verhält es sich mit dem zweiten Teil. Hier herrscht durchaus das Referat vor. Die Erzählung wird nur durch einzelne, leicht ablösbare⁴ interpretierende Bemerkungen unterbrochen. Es stellt sich daher die Frage, ob hier nicht ein Nest eigenständigen, außerkanonischen Materials vorliegt, von dem aus Einzelangaben in den ersten Teil des Kapitels und an andere Stellen des Dialogs hinübergewandert sind. Die Möglichkeit ist um so eher gegeben, als die §§ 7–8 einen in sich geschlossenen Taufbericht bilden.

Walter Bauer hatte, die Taufstimme behandelnd, seinerzeit die Frage gestellt, warum Justin nicht die rettende Hand des Matthäus ergriffen habe, die ihn von all den von ihm nur mühsam überdeckten Schwierigkeiten des von ihm gebotenen Wortlauts bewahrt haben würde. Er hatte vermutet, daß Justin von seinem Gegner dazu gezwungen wurde⁶. Die These ist als solche nicht ganz stichhaltig; denn Justin weiß Christen und Christen zu unterscheiden und läßt sich nicht ohne weiteres von seinen Kontrahenten in die Enge treiben⁷. Aber die Annahme gewinnt an Wahrscheinlichkeit, wenn seinem Gegner nicht nur ein einzelner

¹ Bousset S. 70.

² Vgl. 51,1.

³ So J. C. Th. von Otto, *Corpus Apologetarum I*, 2, S. 320 Anm. 9.

⁴ Es sind die Angabe über die Unscheinbarkeit (*καὶ ἀειδοῦς, ὡς αἱ γραφαὶ ἐκκλησίου, φαινομένοι*) Jesu sowie die theologische Deutung des Berufs Jesu. Die Berufsangabe selbst dürfte zur Quelle gehören; vgl. die ähnliche stilisierte über Johannes im Zitat des Epiphanius Haer. 30,13,6. Einen indirekten Beleg dafür bietet Origenes Cels. VI,36, der bestreitet, daß Jesus in einem der anerkannten Evangelien (*τῶν ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις φερομένων εὐαγγελῶν*) als Zimmermann bezeichnet sei.

⁵ So ist der auf die Memorabilien der Apostel zurückgeföhrte Satz in § 3 zu verstehen. Er hat ursprünglich in § 8 hinter der Berufsangabe seinen Platz gehabt.

⁶ Das Leben Jesu im Zeitalter der neutestamentlichen Apokryphen, 1909, S. 124.

⁷ Vgl. 48,10f.; 49,8; 80,8.

Satz zu Ohren gekommen war, sondern ein Bericht vorgelegen hatte, den auch Justin anerkannte¹. Es ist das Gegebene, diesen im zweiten Teil des Kapitels 88 zu erblicken.

Daraus ergibt sich: die außerkanonischen Täufernachrichten des Justin sind nicht *disjecta membra* sondern entstammen *einem* Traditionstrang. Justin erinnert sich nicht einer oder mehrerer Quellen sondern zitiert in Kap. 88, um seinerseits nur in der Umrahmung einen Einzelzug hinzuzufügen.

Welcher Art ist diese Vorlage? Wilh. Bousset hatte die eigenartigen Züge damit erklären wollen, daß er sie direkt auf die Redenquelle, deren Bekanntschaft bei Justin er also annahm, zurückführte². Die Auskunft, so verlockend sie ist, wird jedenfalls den Problemen des Taufberichts nicht gerecht. Er ist zu eigenartig, als daß von seiner Basis die Entstehung der synoptischen Darstellung erklärt werden könnte.

Ist eine direkte Fixierung durch Rückgriff über die Synoptiker hinaus nicht möglich, so gilt es, diese durch die Analyse der Einzelnachrichten zu versuchen. Der Justinische Bericht ist bestimmt durch das Schema *xatà – ḥvá*. Das ist völlig singulär in den Tauferzählungen. Es handelt sich um so weniger um eine bloße Ausmalung, als es der Terminologie des Proselytenbades entspricht³. Dort war mit dem Hinabsteigen das Rezitieren eines Teils der Auslegung des zuvor nicht verbindlichen Gesetzes durch den Taufassistenten verbunden. Bei der Johannestaufe fand im gleichen Augenblick das Bekenntnis der Sünden statt. In beiden Fällen wurde solchermaßen der Unterschied zwischen Alt und Neu bezeichnet. Die Parallelen legen die Vermutung nahe, daß auch im Justinischen Bericht der durch *xatà* eingeleitete Satz einen Akt impliziert, mit dem es eine besondere Bewandtnis hat.

Es ist die Feuererscheinung auf dem Wasser⁴. Stellt sie etwas von der mit *ḥvá* verbundenen Geistessendung Verschiedenes dar, so kann dabei nur an einen Prüf- oder Reinigungsakt gedacht sein. Durch Wasser und Feuer bewährt erweist sich Jesus als der, über dem die Taufproklamation ausgerufen werden soll. Freilich,

¹ So Bousset S. 70.

² A. a. O. S. 114f.; vgl. S. 70f.

³ Gerim 1: man läßt ihn in das Tauchbad hinabsteigen (Kirchheim S. 38; vgl. D. Daube, *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*, 1956, S. 106ff.).

⁴ Falsch J. Thomas, *Le Mouvement Baptiste en Palestine et Syrie*, 1935, S. 392, der Justin dahin versteht, daß die Feuererscheinung nach dem Aufstieg stattfindet.

⁵ Cross, *Studia Patristica VIII*

die Exegese, die unsere Stelle gefunden hat, wandelt gemeinhin andere Wege. Sie setzt, soweit sie nicht die *ārvá*-Passage einfach als Interpolation abtut¹, die Angabe Justins mit der Lichterscheinung gleich², von der in einem Teil der *Diatessaron*-Überlieferung sowie im *Vercellensis* und *Sangermanensis* die Rede ist³. Das Licht bzw. Feuer gilt dann als optisches Seitenstück zur Proklamation der matthäischen Himmelsstimme. Die Auffassung ist nicht ganz unbegründet. Schon bei Ephraem findet man deutlich diese Parallelisierung und Synchronisierung: *cumque ex lumine super aquas exorto et ex voce de coelo delapsa cognovisset . . .*⁴ Ähnlich, wenngleich nicht ganz so weitgehend ist die Beschreibung der Cambridger Harmonie: *when he was baptizet . . . so com the brightness of hevene and the Holy Gost and a light withinne hym*⁵. Aber die Berichte sind nicht überall so durchstilisiert⁶. Die beiden Altlateiner lassen das Licht aufflammen, als Jesus sich im Wasser befindet und betonen, ganz im Unterschied zur Tatian-Tradition⁷, den schreckhaften Charakter des Geschehnisses⁸. Dann erst, nachdem Jesus emporgestiegen ist, folgt die Himmelsstimme. Dasselbe Bild und dieselbe Folge der Ereignisse ergibt sich aber auch aus dem Hebräerevangelium. Zwar schweigt das Zitat des Hieronymus – es setzt erst mit dem *ascendisset* ein –, aber in der *Praedicatio Pauli* hören wir: *cum baptizaretur ignem super aquam esse visum*, ein Vorgang also, der als der *ascensio* vorgeschaltet zu denken ist. Da, wie C. Peters

¹ So Ad. Merx, *Die vier kanonischen Evangelien II*, 1, 1902, S. 47, der sich damit St. Thirlby, *Justini . . . Apologiae duae et Dialogus cum Tryphone Judaeo*, London 1722, S. 331 und Otto anschließt.

² Vgl. J. Bornemann, *Die Taufe Christi durch Johannes*, 1896, S. 28: 'Feuer- oder Lichterscheinung'.

³ Itala, ed. Ad. Jülicher ad Mt 3,15.

⁴ Aucher-Mösinger S. 43. – Vgl. das Zitat aus Ephraems Epiphanienhymne bei F. C. Burkitt, *S. Ephraim's Quotations from the Gospel*, 1901, S. 67.

⁵ The Pepysian Harmony, ed. by M. Goates (= Early Engl. Text Soc. Original Ser. No. 157) 1922, S. 10.

⁶ Auch nach der anderen Seite hin ist stilisiert worden: die Geistesausgießung wurde bereits mit dem Untertauchen verbunden, in Test Abr 18 und bei Marcus, dem Gnostiker (s. Bauer a. a. O. S. 116).

⁷ Charakteristisch für diese ist die Paraphrase Ishodads: . . . erstrahlte ein starkes Licht . . . es erschienen viele Scharen von Geistwesen, die in der Luft lobsangen . . . ein Duft von Wohlgütern ergoß sich: Ähnlich Jacob Barsalibi; s. F. C. Burkitt, *S. Ephraim's Quotations from the Gospel* S. 68.

⁸ Vgl. die Bemerkung der Aurora: Strahlen gingen aus seinen Augen hervor, durch die sie erschreckt wurden und flohen (Hennecke-Schneemelcher S. 98).

nachgewiesen hat¹, der Taufbericht des Diatessaron oder besser: der herrschende Typ desselben vom Hebräerevangelium abhängig ist, ergibt sich daraus, daß von Tatian selbst oder sehr früh in seiner Tradition eine Abänderung vorgenommen worden ist. Damit im Zusammenhang steht der Wechsel von $\pi\bar{\nu}\varrho$ zu $\varphi\bar{\omega}\varsigma$, welch letzterer Begriff einer bloß signifikatorischen und bald dann nur noch metaphorischen Deutung eher offen steht. Aber $\varphi\bar{\omega}\varsigma$ ist nicht überall durchgedrungen. So bringen die syrischen Johannesakten, die auch sonst tatianische Lesarten enthalten², eine Anwendung der Taufgeschichte, die auf der Feuererscheinung beruht.³ Ganz ebenso enthält Jakob von Serugs Homilie über die Taufe eine mehrfache Erwähnung der Feuerflamme⁴. — Es ist nicht unmöglich, daß eine Verwechslung bei dem Wechsel von Feuer (syrisch *nûhrâ*) zu Licht (syrisch *nûhrâ*) mitgespielt hat.

Das *ávadóeiv* setzt sich fort und drückt sich aus in der Niederrahrt des Geistes und dem Lautwerden der adoptianischen Himmelsstimme. Es ist deutlich, daß diese Form der göttlichen Approbation mit der Feuertaufe sehr viel enger zusammenhängt als der übliche Wortlaut der Proklamation; Sohnesannahme und vorangehende Prüfung bedingen einander. Neben der formalen zeigt sich so auch eine inhaltliche Kongruenz zwischen den beiden Teilen, den durch *xarâ* und *ávâ* markierten Abschnitten des Justinschen Taufberichts.

Diese Angaben sind in eine Skizze über den Täufer eingebettet. Er wird — und das ist völlig singulär im altchristlichen Schrifttum — als *xáthiçómueros* bezeichnet. Das soll keine Abwertung gegenüber dem wandernden Jesus sein⁵, ist vielmehr Bezeichnung der Autorität eines in Vollmacht handelnden Lehrers⁶. Die-

¹ Acta Orientalia XVI, 1938, 259–66.

² S. R. H. Connolly, J. Th. St. VIII, 1907, 255ff.

³ Die syrische Taufliturgie des Severus bringt eine Kompilation verschiedener Taufnotizen (der Text bei A. Resch, Agrapha. Außercanonische Schriftfragmente 1906 S. 75), deren eine noch das Nachwirken der $\pi\bar{\nu}\varrho$ -Tradition erkennen läßt: *absque igne et absque lignis calefactae erant aquae, quando venit filius Dei ut baptizaretur in medio Jordanis.*

⁴ S. R. H. Connolly, a. a. O. 581f.

⁵ So Ed. Zeller, Theol. Jahrb. 1848, 547: „Das *xáthiçómueros* des Täufers bildet hier einen unverkennbaren Gegensatz gegen das thatenvolle Herumwandern Christi . . .“.

⁶ Zum Sitzen des Lehrers s. Mt 23,2; Mk 2,6; Lk 5,17. Dem entspricht das Stehen der Zuhörer, wie es von Mt in stereotyper Wendung erwähnt wird (vgl. R. H. Lightfoot, History and Interpretation in the Gospels, 1935, S. 20). —

selbe Hochschätzung drückt sich in dem *κηρύσσειν*, das sich zum *βοᾶ* steigert, aus. Wie der Beiname *βαπτιστής* ganz fehlt und damit des Johannes Funktion bei der Lustration in den Hintergrund geschoben, auch seine Beteiligung an der Taufe Jesu nicht beschrieben¹ wird, so ist anderseits seine autoritativ-prophe-tische² Qualität hervorgehoben. Freilich wird diese begrenzt durch den betonten Unterschied zu Jesus. Das *οὐκ εἰμὶ ὁ Χριστός* geht über den synoptischen Bericht hinaus, ist stärker aber auch als Joh 1,20, und zwar insofern als es das Bekenntnis zu des Täufers eigener Messianität³ und nicht nur die Erwagung der Möglichkeit derselben voraussetzt⁴. Johannes als Lehrer – das dürfte nicht nur historisch richtig sein sondern entspricht auch dem Bild eines Strangs der täuferischen Literatur-Tradition selber, der mandäischen Literatur, in der die Taufwirksamkeit des Johannes ganz verdunkelt ist. Ähnlich steht es mit den Pseudoklementinen, in denen, ins Negative umgestülpt, dieselbe Anschauung von Johannes dem Lehrer vorliegt⁵. Die präzise und betonte Ablehnung der Messianität aber spiegelt die christlich-täuferische Kontroverse wider. Alles dies – wie schon der Terminus *καθιζόμενος* selber – weist in den judenchristlichen Bereich als den Entstehungsort der Formulierung.

Dabei ist der Bericht gar nicht mit Justins eigener Anschauung vom Täufer kongruent. Die Taufe als eine Salbung durch Elias – dies Herzstück der Argumentation gegen Tryphon⁶ ist im Bericht selbst gar nicht angelegt, ja stößt sich mit der Nichterwähnung einer direkten Funktion des Johannes bei der Taufe Jesu. Wenn Justin dies Ereignis nicht als verliehenen Charakter sondern als

Es liegt nahe, die Variante in Lk 3,7 (*βαπτισθῆναι ἐνάπιον αὐτοῦ* D it) mit dem Bilde vom sitzenden Täufer zu verbinden. – Die Wendung kommt in c. 49,51 und 88 vor. Schon K. A. Credner (Beiträge zur Einleitung in die biblischen Schriften I 1832, S. 218) hatte aus der gleichmäßigen Wiederholung des Ausdrucks gefolgert, daß er auf eine Quelle zurückgehen müsse.

¹ Es entspricht dieser Tendenz, daß bei Tatian zu Mt 3,14f. zu lesen steht: *dominus noster dextram eius (Joannis) sumpsit et super caput suum posuit* (Aucher-Mösinger S. 41f.).

² Unter *προφητεύειν* ist hier wie in 51,3 ein Lehren in Vollmacht zu verstehen.

³ C. 88: *οἱ ἀνθρώποι ὑπελάμβανον αὐτὸν εἶναι τὸν Χριστόν.*

⁴ Vgl. auch das *ἥξει* (statt des synoptischen *ἔρχεται*) im Nachsatz.

⁵ Hom. II, 23; 53 f.

⁶ C. 48–49. – Auch das Bild von der Salbung (doch wohl stehend vollzogen) läßt sich nicht ganz leicht mit dem vom sitzenden Täufer in Übereinstimmung bringen.

Deklaration für das Volk versteht, so ist das dem Bericht völlig fremd.¹ Und davon, daß des Täufers Taufbewegung nichts anderes als die ὁδὸς τοῦ βαπτίσματος Jesu (88,2), so wenig etwas Eigenständiges sei, daß Jesus mit seiner Taufe dem Wirken des Johannes ein Ende setzte (*ἔπαυε*²), davon fehlt im Bericht selbst jede Spur. Alles drei gehört aber für Justin zusammen, wird zum Instrument für die von ihm vollzogene geschichtstheologische Einordnung, in welcher Johannes zwar eine notwendige Funktion zukommt, Taufe wie prophetische Botschaft aber ganz auf Jesus konzentriert und mit seinem Auftreten zum Abschluß gekommen sind. Das Schema, das Justin benutzt, ist seinerseits ein jüdisches³. Aber dessen jüdische Essenz ist verschieden von derjenigen seiner Quelle.

Sucht man den Mutterboden des Berichtes selber zu bestimmen, so ist eine Verwandtschaft mit den judenchristlichen Evangelien offenbar. Neben den berührten Zügen ist auch an das merkwürdige οὐχ ᾧς ἔρθεα im Rahmen Justins zu erinnern, das dem quid peccavi ut vadām des Nazaräerevangeliums thematisch so nahe verwandt ist⁴. Woher hat Justin die Formulierung? Zum ductus der Quelle würde es gut passen, daß die Behauptung der Sündlosigkeit der Prüfung der Reinheit durch das Feuer vorausgegangen ist. Da die Quelle recht unvermittelt einsetzt, ist ohnehin deutlich, daß Justin den Anfang des Taufberichts abgeschnitten hat. Man wird so mit Fug annehmen dürfen, daß die Quelle neben einführenden Personalangaben über Johannes und Jesus einen Satz enthalten hat, der die Notwendigkeit der Taufe Jesu ventilierte⁵. Neben diesen Zügen naher Verwandtschaft stehen aber auch Unterschiede. Es fällt auf, daß in den judenchristlichen Evangelien Mittel der Regie eingebaut sind, um den Abstand zwischen Johannes und Jesus zu verdeutlichen (Jesus kommt erst, als das Volk schon getauft ist; nach seiner Taufe begehrt Johannes, von ihm getauft zu werden). Sodann ist dort neben der asketischen Haltung und der Taufwirksamkeit die Ver-

¹ Vgl. J. Bornemann, a. a. O., S. 30.

² 51,3; vgl. 52,5–8. — Der Justinsche Topos, daß Jesus dem Johannes in seiner Taufwirksamkeit ein Ende setzte, findet sich auch bei Ephraem: er ließ sich taufen, *ut baptismo suo Joannis baptismo finem imponerat* (Aucher-Mössinger S. 41).

³ Ebenso wie das andere von der doppelten Parusie.

⁴ Anders A. Resch, a. a. O., S. 234: „es fehlen hierzu alle kanonischen und sonstigen patristischen Parallelen“.

⁵ Sie ist von Justin für die Zwecke seiner Einleitung umgestaltet worden.

kündigung des Täufers ganz versunken. Die Unterschiede setzen Wandlungen und Entwicklungen voraus und machen es wahrscheinlich, daß der Justinsche Bericht eine ältere Schicht wider spiegelt. Nicht, wie Bousset wollte¹, eine frühe Fassung der Redenquelle, wohl aber eine Vorstufe der judenchristlichen Evangelien zeichnet sich hinter der Quelle ab, eine Erzählung, die Justin in ein theologisches System gespannt und mit der er versucht hat, den historisch-annalistischen Bedürfnissen seiner Leser gerecht zu werden.

Den mannigfachen Versuchen, Justin auf eine Seite der altchristlichen Theologiegeschichte festzulegen, hatte Mor. v. Engelhardt ein Ende gesetzt, in dem er auf theologische Inkonzin nitäten im Justinschen Werk hinweist². Er selbst hatte sie durch die Unterscheidung zwischen Gemeindeglauben und Justins eigener Theologie erklären wollen.³ Handelt es sich aber wirklich um eine Kontrapunktik innerhalb derselben Phase und Generation? Schon Ad. Harnack zögerte, sich die These seines Dorn pater Lehrers zu eigen zu machen und wollte eher an Elemente des Gemeindekultus denken, an liturgische Formeln, die bis auf das apostolische Zeitalter zurückweisen⁴. Wie recht er damit hatte,

¹ A. a. O. S. 114.

² Das Christentum Justins des Märtyrers, Erlangen 1878, S. 69 u. ö. war von gewissen Anregungen J. C. Th. v. Ottos bestimmt, wie S. 47 seiner eigenen Darstellung zeigt.

³ Wichtig ist F. Overbecks ausführliche Besprechung des E'schen Werkes in Hist. Zeitschr. 44, 1880. O. moniert u. a., daß E. die „mindestens indirekten Einwirkungen jüdischen Christentums“ nicht richtig erkannt habe (S. 503). Zeigt sich darin das Erbe der Tübinger Anschauungen, so hat doch O. das selbe weder hier noch in seinem vielfach auf Justin verweisenden Kommentar zur Apostelgeschichte (1870) fruchtbar gemacht.

⁴ Brief Harnacks an Overbeck v. 10. 11. 1880: „... Unzweifelhaft wiederholt Justin eine Reihe von Formeln als sein geistiges Eigentum, auf welche er auch Gewicht legt, die in den Rahmen seiner Theologie nicht passen. Es scheinen liturgische Formeln zu sein, die in den Gemeinden üblich waren ... Die Herkunft der Formeln verdiente freilich eine besondere Untersuchung. Eine solche aber würde in eine sehr frühe Zeit zurückführen d. h. wenn auch nicht auf neutestamentliche Urkunden, so doch auf die religiösen Vorstellungs Kreise des apostolischen Zeitalters. Hat nun Engelhardt seiner Beobachtung eine ganz trügerische Deutung gegeben, so ist doch die Beobachtung selbst wertvoll und lehrreich. Nur ist nicht von Gemeindeglauben sondern von Gemeindekultus zu sprechen, der allem Anschein nach dasjenige Element gewesen ist, welches am altertümlichsten verblieben ist ...“ (Overbeck-Nachlaß, U. B. Basel).

wird gerade aus Dial 45¹ und 51² ersichtlich, Stellen, die deutlich formelhaften Charakter haben. Neben dieser durchaus nicht heterodoxen Lehre heben sich aber haggadische Bestandteile heraus, die ihre Herkunft aus dem spezifisch juden-christlichen Bereiche verraten. Man wird gewiß differenzieren müssen, nicht glauben dürfen, daß von hier aus das ganze Problem der Evangelienzitate Justins³ seine Lösung erfährt. Es genügt zunächst, allgemein von Bousset zu Credner und den Tübinger zurückzulenken, durch ein Beispiel klarzustellen, daß sich neben vielem anderen auch eingetrocknete judenchristliche Farbstoffe auf der Palette des auf den ersten Blick so einflächig erscheinenden Apologeten befunden haben werden.

¹ Der Beginn des Zitats ist durch das hymnische ὅς markiert. Die Formel dürfte bis καταλνθῶσι gereicht haben.

² Das Zitat läuft von αὐτὸς λέγων bis ὄνόματι αὐτοῦ.

³ Verbunden mit der behandelten ist die Frage einer vortatianischen Evangelienharmonie, wie sie E. Lippelt (*Quae fuerint Justini Martyris ἀπομνημονεύματα quaque ratione cum forma evangeliorum Syro-Latina cohaeserint*, 1901) aufgeworfen hat. Wichtig ist, daß W. Bousset, der sich zunächst recht skeptisch äußerte (Theol. Rundsch. 1903, 478), später der Lippeltschen These recht nahe kam (Theol. Rundsch. 1914, 191), ohne daß er freilich an ein judenchristliches Einsprengsel gedacht hätte. Allzu apodiktisch ist der Widerspruch, den C. Peters (*Das Diatessaron Tatians*, Rom 1939, S. 16f.) gegen eine solche Möglichkeit erhoben hat. — Auffallend ist jedenfalls, daß Tatian verschiedentlich mit den Evangelienzitaten Justins übereinstimmt; so in Mt 19,16f. (vgl. A. Harnack, *ZKG* 1881, 486) = Dial 101; Lk 22,44 (Aucher-Mösinger S. 235) = Dial 103.

«*Sitz im Leben*»
des actes apocryphes du Nouveau Testament

A. HAMMAN O. F. M., Besançon

Les actes apocryphes du Nouveau Testament se présentent à nous grevés des affirmations de la Religionsgeschichte qui les classaient collectivement dans les écrits gnostiques. Qu'il y ait des textes, des prières et des hymnes surtout, qui soient suspects d'hérétodoxie et même de gnosticisme, la chose est indéniable, pour les actes de Jean et de Thomas. Mais trop souvent la thèse d'une rédaction entièrement gnostique, parfois corrigée par une main catholique, s'est échafaudée. Il suffit de lire le *Handbuch zu den Neutestamentlichen Apokryphen* d'Edgar Hennecke. La thèse diamétralement opposée pourrait être défendue: nous sommes en présence de textes en principe orthodoxes, remaniés par des mains gnostiques pour le besoin de leur cause.

Notre analyse voudrait étudier le faisceau des cinq actes apocryphes de Thomas, André, Jean, Paul et Pierre, que Photius affirmait être l'œuvre d'un même auteur, Leucius Charinus¹. Nous n'envisagerons point ici leur interdépendance, qui exigerait une étude spéciale.

1. Analyse des actes de Thomas

Les actes peuvent nous servir de plaque tournante, dans l'analyse, car ils présentent le texte le mieux conservé et qui seul est complet. Ils ont été composés en syriaque, probablement à Edesse, au plus tard au début du IIIe siècle. Tout ce qui touche l'apôtre Thomas est lié à la Syrie orientale. Il semble que les actes dépendent de l'évangile de Thomas. Dans l'un et l'autre écrit Thomas est appelé «jumeau du Seigneur».

L'apôtre Thomas qui prêche l'Évangile est présenté dans les actes apocryphes comme un parfait religieux. Il vit dans la pau-

¹ Photius, *Bibliotheca*, 114, PG 103, 389.

vreté, la chasteté. Vin et viande sont exclus de sa vie. Il vit de pain et de sel. Dès l'abord, au mariage de la fille du roi, il prêche aux jeunes époux la continence absolue¹. Il en est de même au baptême du roi Gundafor et de son frère Gad, à celui de Mygdonia, de Tertia, femme du roi². Pour Thomas la vie chrétienne est incompatible avec la vie conjugale; elle exige le célibat. Une jeune fille ressuscité raconte avoir vu l'enfer peuplé non seulement d'adultères, d'impudiques, mais aussi «de ceux qui ont fait usage du mariage³». Il n'existe pas un texte qui tempère cette rigueur.

Les textes liturgiques et les prières des mêmes actes, qui exigeaient une étude spéciale⁴, émettent le même jugement. C'est plus particulièrement le cas d'une prière qui exceptionnellement est au pluriel. Elle rend grâce pour ceux qui vivent dans la pauvreté, la continence, l'ascèse.

Nous te rendons grâces pour les dons que tu nous a faits,
et pour le secours qui nous vient de toi et pour la providence
qui de toi est venue jusqu'à nous.

Achève cette œuvre en nous jusqu'à la fin,
afin que nous ayons l'assurance qui vient de toi.

Jette les regards sur nous, à cause de toi:
nous avons quitté nos maisons et notre patrimoine;
à cause de toi nous sommes devenus joyeusement
et volontiers des étrangers.

Jette tes yeux sur nous, Seigneur, pour toi
nous avons abandonné notre bien propre,
pour t'acquérir toi, le bien qu'on ne peut enlever.

Jette tes yeux sur nous, Seigneur: nous avons quitté
ta parenté pour nous unir à ta famille.

Jette tes jeux sur nous, Seigneur, qui avons quitté
nos pères, nos mères, nos nourriciers, afin de voir ton Père
et être rassasiés de la nourriture de la divinité.

Jette tes yeux sur nous, Seigneur: car à cause de toi
nous avons quitté nos épouses charnelles et nos fruits terrestres,
afin de nous unir à la communauté définitive et vraie

¹ Actes de Thomas, 12, 13.

² Ib. 28, 117, 130, 150.

³ Ib. 55.

⁴ Voir notre livre, *La Prière*, t. II: *Les trois premiers siècles*, Paris, 1963,
p. 209–220.

et de produire des fruits véritables, dont la nature est d'en-haut, dont personne ne peut nous dépoiller,
qui restent auprès de nous et auprès de qui nous restons¹.

Cette prière est admirablement construite. La balancement des propositions, l'accumulation des motifs, la répétition des *επιθέτων* lui donne une allure classique. D'où vient le pluriel insolite ? Au nom de qui parle la prière ? Ne s'agit-il pas d'une communauté ou d'un groupe religieux qui pratique l'ascèse, dans la pauvreté et la continence ?

Nous trouvons les mêmes éléments dans les autres apocryphes, il serait facile d'en multiplier les exemples. Trois éléments sont repris sans cesse par les actes apocryphes comme des leitmotive :

1. La vie chrétienne exige la continence. Ce thème revient dans les actes de Jean. Il suffit de s'en rapporter à la conversion de Drusiana et de son mari², à la confession finale de l'apôtre lui-même³. L'histoire de Thècle, dans les actes de Paul, illustre la même thèse.

2. Dans tous les actes apocryphes, la femme, – ou plus justement la vierge et non la mère – joue un rôle central et déterminant. Ce rôle ne tient pas à sa féminité, car les actes ne peuvent pas assez mettre en garde contre la beauté féminine, mais à son rôle dans l'économie du salut. D'elle dépend la proximité du royaume de Dieu, le renversement de l'ordre actuel des choses, qui coïncident avec l'arrêt de la procréation.

3. A plusieurs reprises les actes ne parlent pas au nom d'une seule personne mais d'un groupe. «Tu nous a envoyés comme apôtres parmi les nations⁴», disent les actes de Jean. Même témoignage, dans la prière citée plus haut. Il semble bien que les actes s'adressent à un milieu, qu'ils veulent enseigner, exhorter, tenir en éveil. Ils expriment une théologie qu'il nous faut d'abord mieux cerner.

2. Textes convergents

Nous avons d'autres textes qui professent un enseignement assez semblable.

¹ Ib. 60–61.

² Actes de Jean, 84.

³ Ib 113–114.

⁴ Ib. 112.

Les Odes de Salomon

Ces poèmes sont une composition de l'ancienne communauté syrienne. Il suffit pour s'en convaincre d'analyser le style et le rythme, le lyrisme et l'élan mystique. La théologie professée est typiquement syrienne.

L'ode 33 s'adresse à une communauté privilégiée, qui se tient loin de la communauté commune. Ils s'intitulent «des saints¹», terme qui devient synonyme de «continents». Le terme se retrouve dans cette acception dans les deux lettres du Pseudo-Clément et dans les actes de Gouria. Cette vie des saints, vie d'incorruptibilité, est liée à un style de vie chrétien particulier, où la continence est professée rigoureusement. Les Odes jettent une suspicion systématique sur le mariage².

Lettre ou Lettres du Ps. Clément

Ces deux lettres, qui à l'origine furent peut-être un même texte, adressées à deux communautés, proviennent de Syrie ou de Mésopotamie. Elles ont été écrites par un ascète chevronné à des vierges des deux sexes, «des saints du Nouveau Testament», qui vivaient en communauté mixte, sous le même toit, et attendaient le royaume. C'est une mise en garde sévère contre les dangers de la mixité, contre laquelle les conciles de la Syrie vont lutter jusqu'au VIe siècle.

L'écrit du Ps. Ephrem

Le texte attribué à Ephrem³, conservé en arménien, a été écrit, comme l'a montré Vööbus⁴, en syriaque et date de la fin du IIe siècle. Il est donc lui aussi contemporain des actes apocryphes. Le document décrit la vie chrétienne. Ceux qui suivent le Christ vivent de la même vie que les apôtres. Ils se séparent du monde pour le boire et le manger. Ils abandonnent maisons, foyers, relations pour un mode de vie spirituel. Cet état de vie semble caractériser «une communauté ordinaire», un groupe, qui va au-delà de ce qu'exige la vie chétienne. Ils se présentent comme les chrétiens par excellence.

¹ Odes 33,5–7; f. 7,16; 22,12; 23,1.

² Par exemple Ode, 11, 21.

³ Chez A. Vööbus, Celibacy, a requirement for admission to baptism in the early Syrian Church, Stockholm, 1951, p. 23–24.

⁴ Ibid. 23.

De tous ces textes, il semble ressortir clairement qu'il a existé en Syrie, probablement dès la fin du Ier siècle et au cours du IIe siècle, des groupes religieux, qui sont allés plus loin que ce qu'exigeait la vie chrétienne normale. Il s'agit de célibataires, *virgines subintroducti et subintroductae*, qui souvent ensemble vivent la vie ascétique, sous un même toit. C'est dans ces milieu qu'il importe de chercher le *Sitz im Leben* des actes apocryphes.

3. Analyse du monachisme primitif

D'où viennent ces groupes religieux ? Les textes analysés, auxquels nous pourrions joindre certains passages du Pasteur d'Herma¹, nous orientent vers le milieu judéo-chrétien. Il s'agit vraisemblablement d'esséniens convertis ou de chrétiens, tributaires de milieux et de courants piétistes juifs, plus ou moins rattachés à l'Evangile. Ils pratiquent l'abstinence de viande et de vin, la continence absolue, la désappropriation ; ils pratiquent des purifications multiples, ce qui a fait accréditer le terme *λοῦτρον* pour le baptême lui-même.

Ces courants sont extérieurs aux courants hétérodoxes. Ils se trouvent chez orthodoxes et hétérodoxes. Leurs tendances favoriseront le passage aux positions hérétiques d'un Marcion, d'un Valentin. Nous savons que le père de Mani avait trouvé des apocryphes dans le milieu encratite de Mésopotamie. Loin d'être les pères de la littérature apocryphe, les gnostiques paraissent plutôt en être les héritiers.

Tout ce qui touche ce monachisme primitif suit un ligne géographique, qui part de Palestine, monte vers la Syrie, puis vers la Syrie orientale, avec la capitale Edesse comme centre, plus tard Adiabène. C'est d'ailleurs l'Eglise de ces régions, qui, au cours des siècles, a maille à partir avec les groupes d'ascètes et réagit contre les abus.

Il s'agit donc d'un phénomène syrien ; il se rencontre avant tout dans la littérature issue de cette aire géographique, et suit la ligne de progression de l'évangélisation. Là semble se trouver le berceau du monachisme.

Cette localisation permet de préciser la littérature et souvent de la localiser, quand elle est caractéristique de ces milieux ascétiques.

¹ Par exemple, Vis. II, 4,3; Mand. VIII, 8.

4. Enseignement de l'ascèse primitive

Il faut ici éviter toute systématisation excessive. Les rapports de ces milieux avec la grande Eglise sont flous. Ils peuvent aller de l'orthodoxie jusqu'à l'hétérodoxie.

Un premier indice est frappant : l'apôtre Jacques, le protecteur du judéo-christianisme, est vénéré dans ces milieux. On lui attribue deux lettres sur la virginité¹. C'est son autorité qui accrédite le «mythe Clément», dans les mêmes milieux, où Clément passe pour un ami de Jacques². Pour cette raison les deux lettres aux ascètes lui sont attribuées.

Plus profondément, ces milieux ascétiques professent un prophétisme eschatologique. Le royaume de Dieu est imminent. La prédication des missionnaires doit accélérer cette venue. L'eschatologie commande l'ascèse. Deux phénomènes avant-coureurs caractérisent cette venue : la résurrection du Christ, qui revient sans cesse dans la littérature apocryphe des actes, la virginité de Marie, comme anticipation du royaume, thème cher à toute la théologie syrienne et qui se retrouve dans la littérature apocryphe.

De ces prémisses les ascètes tirent des conséquences d'ordre spéculatif, dont l'orthodoxie n'est pas toujours garantie. L'obstacle à la venue du royaume est la procréation. Cet ordre de la nature a été renversé par l'Evangile. Cette affirmation se trouve dans les évangiles selon les Egyptiens et de Thomas³. Elle semble également être l'explication de la crucifixion de Pierre, la tête en bas. De là provient la suspicion et le rejet du mariage, thème qui traverse tous les actes apocryphes. Il est en quelque sorte l'obstacle au royaume eschatologique.

Les mêmes milieux ascétiques fournissent une explication «sexuelle» de la faute d'Adam. Le baptême est considéré non seulement comme un retour au paradis, ce qui paraît orthodoxe, mais comme un retour à l'état d'Adam enfant, antérieur à l'expérience sexuelle. Pour cette raison, le Christ paraît sans cesse dans les actes apocryphes sous les formes d'un jeune homme ou même d'un jeune enfant⁴. L'évangile de Thomas compare les ascètes à de jeunes enfants : Jésus vit des petits qui tétaient : il

¹ Epiphane, Panarion, 30,2.

² Hermès Pasteur, Mand., IV, 3.

³ Par ex. Evangile de Thomas, 24, 27, 42.

⁴ Actes de Thomas, 27. Actes de Jean, 87. Actes de Pierre, 5.

dit à ses disciples : «Ces petits qui tettent sont semblables à ceux qui entrent dans le royaume.» Eux lui dirent : «Si nous sommes petits entrerons-nous dans le royaume?» Jésus leur dit : «Lorsque vous ferez les deux <être> un et que vous ferez le dedans comme le dehors et le dehors comme le dedans, et le haut comme le bas! Et si vous faites le mâle et la femelle en un seul, afin que le mâle ne soit plus mâle et que la femelle ne soit plus femelle, . . . alors vous entrerez dans [le royaume]»¹.

Pour la même raison, le Christ apparaît nu dans les actes de Jean², comme Adam avant le péché. Ce rétablissement de l'ordre primitif est également exprimé par les animaux qui se mettent au service des apôtres³, ou par le lion qui a été baptisé⁴. Toutes ces images signifient que l'Evangile a rétabli l'ordre paradisiaque.

Sans aller jusque là, l'Eglise syrienne, pour marquer son estime de la virginité, baptisait en premier lieu ceux qui s'étaient déterminés à observer la continence absolue⁵.

L'Eglise n'a pas approuvé toutes les spéculations des milieux ascétiques. Il reste que ces tendances ont pesé sur elle et exercé une étonnante fascination. En durcissant ces positions doctrinales, les ascètes deviennent hétérodoxes et tournent à la secte; des autres vont grossir les rangs gnostiques. L'histoire a conservé le nom de Jules Cassien. Tatien, qui s'est fixé dans la Syrie orientale, a considéré le mariage comme un stupre⁶. Son Diatessaron, qui influença profondément les apocryphes, avait pratiqué la castration de tous les textes évangéliques relatifs au mariage chrétien⁷. Les mêmes déviations se retrouvent chez les Valentiniens et les Marcionites.

L'écheveau du monachisme primitif dont nous avons voulu démêler les fils, est constitué des encratites, ébionites, mandéens, elchasaïtes, qui ont tous une parenté ascétique et le même dénominateur. A ces groupes de piété, sans structure rigoureuse,

¹ Evangile de Thomas, 27. Trad. J. Doresse.

² Actes de Jean 110.

³ Actes de Thomas 39.

⁴ Voir le rapport de W. Schneemelcher, dans le même volume.

⁵ Testamentum D. N. J. Ch., éd. Rahmani, 126.

⁶ Irénée, Adversus haereses, I, 28, 1.

⁷ La démonstration en a été faite par E. Peterson dont toute l'étude serait à relire: Einige Bemerkungen zum Hamburger Papyrusfragment der Acta Pauli, dans Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis, Freiburg, 1959, 208, 206, 203. Lire aussi dans le même ouvrage: Einige Beobachtungen zu den Anfängen der christl. Askese, 209–220.

plus fervents qu'éclairés, peu pointilleux sur la question d'orthodoxie, les actes apocryphes ont sans doute servi de manuel ou de catéchisme. Ce qui explique l'abondance de prières, de discours, qui jalonnent le récit. Ces prédications avaient indubitablement une raison parénétique et didactique. L'insistance sur la continence, sur la pauvreté, prouve bien qu'il s'agit non du peuple chrétien, mais de groupes religieux dont il fallait parfaire la formation spirituelle et entretenir la ferveur.

L'étude des apocryphes serait à reprendre sous ce jour nouveau, qui permettrait à la fois de mieux leur faire justice et de mieux reconstituer les formes complexes de la vie chrétienne au IIe et IIIe siècles¹.

¹ Nous rappelons pour mémoire notre article, *Le Sitz im Leben* des Actes de Thomas, paru dans *Studia Evangelica* III, Berlin 1964 (TU 88), pp. 383–389.

The Dialogue between Timothy and Aquila

A late Survival of an early Form of Christian Apologetic

B. P. W. S. HUNT, Norwich

It is a strange fact, too little noted, that nowhere in the New Testament do we find the fundamental arguments that persuaded the orthodox Jew to become a Christian. Nowhere is there any attempt to *prove* the divinity of our Lord or the supersession of the old Israel by the 'Israel of God'; these facts are taken for granted by both writers and readers. Yet it must have needed very cogent proofs on the day of Pentecost to persuade the Jew whose major tenet was 'The Lord our God is *one* Lord' to worship a man, whom he may actually have seen and certainly knew had been crucified as a felon, as *κύριος*, which corresponds to the ineffable name. Where are these arguments to be found? I believe in a cycle of literature, which for convenience I will call 'the Dialogues', of which Timothy and Aquila is one¹. These were current in every part of the Christian world, from Seville to Edessa, from Constantinople to Alexandria, from Italy to Carthage. It is true that in their present form the earliest dates from the 2nd. century; but they all contain the same arguments, based upon the same testimonies, so that it is obvious that they all derive from a much earlier source than themselves. I believe that this original source was that primitive teaching which set forth the arguments which persuaded the Jew of the truth of the Christian claims. We know of no *other* arguments than these, and though they may not appeal to the twentieth century they certainly did to the Jew of the first. Furthermore I would remind you that *all* the books of the New Testament are secondary to the teaching referred to above, and that they could not have been written had not their readers already assimilated it.

¹ The Greek text, with introduction, was published by F. C. Conybeare in *Anecdota Oxoniensia VIII*, 1898.

It is quite certain that many of these arguments were known to the writers of the New Testament; and some portions of it can only rightly be understood by those who know them. For instance, how many people know that Heb. 4, 12 is contrasting the circumcision of Israel by Jesus the son of Nun before they entered the promised land, with the spiritual circumcision of the new Israel by Jesus the living Word, the Son of God, before they could enter a better promised land than Canaan? Or realise that, as they stand, the texts quoted by St. Paul, 'The elder shall serve the younger', 'Jacob have I loved but Esau have I hated', completely defeat his argument (since Jacob stands for the Jew and Esau for the Gentile), *unless* we know the arguments in our dialogues based upon these very texts?

I must draw attention to the fact, usually completely disregarded, that all the events of our Lord's life as recorded in the Gospels, and many more, were known to the primitive Church decades before any Gospel was written. It is not, therefore, necessary to suppose that *all* the information which the early writers, still less the Apostles, possessed was drawn from them; even Streeter makes this mistake. Thus Timothy and Aquila's account of the triumphal entry differs in several points from that of the Gospels, and is obviously more authentic. For it explains the strange picture presented to us in Mt. 21,5 of 'the children crying in the Temple'. For the 'children' have become adult Jews, and it is not in the Temple itself that they cried 'Hosanna', but *ἐν τῷ εἰσελθεῖν αὐτὸν εἰς ναόν*, a very different thing. It is difficult to understand how children were allowed to brawl in the Temple itself, when all the priests had to do was to 'shoo' them out. But it was not so easy to control an enthusiastic crowd of pilgrims who were *outside* acclaiming our Lord as He went into the Temple, as our dialogue states. There is corroborative evidence of this account in the 'Acts of Pilate', and the later you date this work the less likely is it to have contradicted the Gospels, unless it was stating the truth. It is also significant that Theodulph (c. 821) wrote: — *Plebs Hebraica tibi cum palmis obvia venit*, an exact translation of Timothy and Aquila, with one exception.

For there is not the slightest doubt that Timothy and Aquila is right in substituting 'olive branches' for 'palms'; for the palm does not grow in Jerusalem, which is some 2,000 feet above sea level. Therefore the branches which were broken down by the people

who *met* our Lord must have been of olive, though possibly some of the pilgrims may have carried palms with them from Jericho. It is unimportant little details like this that ring true, and are much more convincing than logical argument.

But Timothy and Aquila does not merely correct the Gospels in unimportant details, it contradicts it in important ones. It tells us that the *only* words spoken by our Lord at his trial before Caiaphas were: — ‘Behold, your house is left unto you desolate’. No writer so late as the end of the 2nd. century could possibly have *invented* such a statement; he must have derived it from a source that he thought more authentic than the Gospels. Again it is significant to notice that the two Gospels which record this denunciation (Mt. 23,38 and Lk. 13,35) do not agree as to its occasion; in Luke it comes before the triumphal entry, in Matthew after it. Another small point. Timothy and Aquila says: — ‘When the Children of the Hebrews met Him crying “Hosanna” as He went into the Temple, then the High Priests and Elders of the people surrounded Him and said: — “Do you not hear what these witness against you?”’ Now these are the exact words used by Caiaphas at his trial when ‘many more bare false witness against Him’, but we are not told what that witness was. I suggest that the cries of the Palm Sunday crowd witnessed *against* Him because they saluted Him as Messiah, and He had not discouraged them. The writer of the *original* dialogue, or its source, knew that this was one of the charges brought against our Lord, though it was not mentioned in the Gospels, and ‘back-dated’ the question of Caiaphas to the occasion to which it referred. After all, what happened then was the most damaging evidence that could be brought against the Accused, yet the Gospels completely disregard it; but our original writer shows that he knew that it was one of the counts of the indictment by the incidental change of a single word (Mt. 21,16).

Another interesting uncanonical addition is found immediately after Mt. 27,45, where Timothy and Aquila adds: — ‘And then it became light again’; and comments: — ‘As is written in Isaiah: — “The sun shall be darkened at mid-day, and the sun shall be dark in the middle of the day, but towards evening it shall be light”’. This is a composite quotation from Is. 13,10, Amos 8,9, and Zec. 14,7; and the addition is found in Tatian and also in Cod. Bobiensis (k). In Timothy and Aquila there follows a description of what happened to the

risen saints (Mt. 27,52), which also seems to have some affinity with Tatian.

It is significant that Aquila enumerates a number of events in the life of our Lord and cites them as disproving the Christian thesis. To quote: — ‘Was God suckled by his mother? . . . He fled when John was beheaded by Herod; . . . he was betrayed by his own disciple; . . . he was bound and scourged and crucified and buried; he was hungry and thirsty and tempted by Satan. Surely a God would not have endured such things at the hand of men? . . . Not to mention that he suffered such things as no God could suffer . . . How is it that you are not ashamed to say that he was God since he entered into the womb of a woman and was born? For if he was born he did not exist from eternity. . . . What do you say to these arguments? Answer me.’ Here speaks the authentic voice of Judaism on the day of Pentecost itself. This was the contemptuous argument that was flung at the heads of the Apostles then, with the crucifixion scarcely six weeks away and still fresh in the memories of everyone. It was no new invention of our writer, for these questions, or some exactly like them, were asked then, and had to be answered. Timothy answers them in the same way as did the Apostles, that so far from such events casting any reflection on the Messiahship and divinity of our Lord they proved them. For this was the exact pattern set out in the O. T. which Messiah was to follow. In the O. T. you had an outline sketch; in the life of Jesus of Nazareth that sketch was filled in with brilliant and convincing colours.

Another important point. In almost all of the dialogues of this type the Christian asks the Jew: — ‘When God said, “Let *us* make man”, to whom was He speaking?’ The Jew answers (as we know from Justin): — ‘He was speaking to the Angels’. The Christian replies: — ‘But to which *angel* did God say at any time: — “Thou art my Son, to-day have I begotten Thee?” Or: — “Let all the Angels of God worship Him”? Still less could he have said to any *angel*: — “Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundations of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thy hands”.’ And, as we read, the real meaning of Heb. 1 becomes clear. This argument (apart from Heb. 1) is at least as old as Barnabas, where it is mentioned quite incidentally (cap. 5), but I think that we can go further than that. For I would draw attention to the fact that the only strictly theological discussion recorded in the Gospels is exactly on this point (Mt. 22,

43–44; Mk. 12,36–37; Lk. 20,42–43); for what our Lord is really asking his opponents is ‘Why is the Messiah called “Lord”, and bidden to sit at God’s right hand?’ To which they could make no reply. ‘Athanasius and Zacchaeus’ actually states that our Lord added the words which we find in Heb. 1,13: – ‘To which of the angels said God at any time: – “Sit on my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool”?’ The theory that there is some kind of plurality within the Godhead is reinforced by other texts, such as ‘The Lord rained fire and brimstone from the Lord’ (Gen. 19,24). ‘What Lord from what Lord?’ asks the Christian.

There is another interesting point about ‘Timothy and Aquila’. It defends the text of the LXX against Aquila’s version, giving a full account of the translation of the LXX itself and also of Aquila himself; because the Jew claims that the true version did not contain some of the texts as quoted by the Christian. When we realise that all the extant versions of the LXX are Christian texts we wonder whether there may not be some truth in the accusation; and the evidence that the early Christians, including St. Paul, ‘accommodated’ the text of the LXX on occasions is too strong to refute. Timothy also records that two versions of the O. T. were found, hidden in jars, ‘one at Jericho and the other in Nicopolis, which is Emmaus. Who translated them we do not know, for they were found in the days of the desolation of Judaea under Vespasian’. It is possible that these were Quinta and Sexta; but whether they were the same scrolls as those mentioned by Eusebius (H. E. VI 16) and Epiphanius (De mens. et pond. XVIII) it is not possible to say; but it is noticeable that Timothy gives not only the location where later the ‘Dead Sea Scrolls’ were found, but also the date attributed to them by many scholars; perhaps they belonged to the same ‘batch’.

It is a sign of the primitive source of our dialogues, which underlies them all, that it was concerned almost entirely with our Lord as Messiah and Son of God. For when the Jew disappeared from the picture the emphasis shifted and was more concerned with the relationship between the Father and the Son. But nowhere in our dialogues is there any reference to any Christological heresies; so far as the writer is concerned they may never have existed. Such simple and naïve writings could never have been composed by theologians of the 4th. or 5th. centuries. But the very fact of their primitive origin made them valuable as re-

statements of the Faith in terms that the simplest people could understand. Give the interlocutors some well-known names and the orthodox could find in them a most valuable weapon; not this time against the Jew but against the heretic. For I would point out that most of the Christological heresies were in fact, if not in intention, an effort to effect a compromise between the Jewish idea of the unity of God and the Christian idea of the Trinity. Therefore in all parts of the world, from Seville to Edessa, from Alexandria to Carthage, when confronted with such heresies scholars remembered the original answers of the Christian Church to the Jews of the first century, then as now almost forgotten, and taking them down from their dusty shelves reproduced them for the benefit of the people of their own time. Thus Irenaeus in his 'Apostolic Preaching' (a title which acknowledges the source of his material), Tertullian (especially in his 'Adversus Praxeans'), and Ps.-Gregory of Nyssa, to mention only three writers covering widely separated portions of the Christian Church, reopened this ancient armoury and found therein weapons exactly suited to their needs against these new opponents. Their example was followed by many others, and it was not until the age of heresy ceased (if it ever has ceased) that this old literature was once again buried in an obscurity that has lasted to the present day.

**S. Joannis Damasceni De haeresibus
cap. CI and Islam**

N. Q. KING, Makerere (Uganda)

During the last century and a half Islam and Christianity have come into a closer "meeting" and "dialogue" than they have enjoyed since their early days. As one talks with one's Muslim counter-part in the cities of Africa and along her trade-routes, the mind goes back to one of the more ancient sources we have concerning the Christian approach to Islam. Chapter CI of the *de haeresibus* attributed to St. John of Damascus is devoted to the subject¹. It is true that it seems like an appendix to the book proper and that it is probably not by the master himself, but it is certainly good evidence for the state of affairs before the Crusades brought in that element of deep bitterness and blind hate which has made relationships between the two religions so difficult. The purpose of this paper is to review what this chapter tells us about the encounter of Christianity and Islam in late patristic times and to bring out some of its relevance to the present day.

The heart of the discussion remains uncannily the same. It centres round the nature of God and of Christ and the reality of his death and resurrection. The Muslim emphasises that God is one, he is the maker of all things, he is neither begotten nor begetting. Christ is the Word of God and his Spirit, a person created and a servant born of Mary the sister of Moses without seed. The Word and the Spirit entered Mary and begat Jesus who is a

¹ PG 94, 764–773. The Chapter appears to have suffered some mutilation in transmission. Kindred material is to be found for instance at 94, 1585–1598, 96, 1335–1348 and 97, 1543–1562. A. Abel, "La polémique damascénienne et son influence sur les origines de la théologie musulmane", in the symposium "L'élaboration de l'Islam", Paris, 1961, states at p. 65 that the chapter is late tenth century. One is not entirely convinced by his reasoning, but a date even as late as his does not materially affect the purposes of this paper.

prophet and a servant of God¹. God being great and one who could not beget as humans beget, he could therefore have no son. Every reverence and high honour short of this is given to Jesus and his Mother. The Christian writer does not bother to point out that every orthodox Christian Father would equally have insisted that God does not beget as men beget, but sonship, for lack of sufficient human words, indicates the closeness of relationship. One is tempted to think the patristic *unius substantiae* would have been less liable to misunderstanding than the Biblical sonship.

The writer then reports how the Muslim quickly comes to the other great *crux*. When “the Jews illegally wished to crucify him, they seized him, and crucified his shadow. Himself the Christ they did not crucify, nor did he die. For God took him unto himself into heaven, for he loved him”². Presumably the main Qur’anic statement on the crucifixion is in mind³. The writer who is in this matter a fairly early authority and whose Greek is clear at this point, takes it that his opponents allege that Jesus’ shadow or shade or phantom was crucified. Other Muslims, interpreting differently the somewhat obscure Arabic, take it that a likeness (of crucifixion) was shown them. Some see in this knowledge on the Prophet’s part of the gnostic legend that someone else suffered in Jesus’ place or that he suffered only in seeming. The patristic tradition itself found difficulty with Christ’s suffering, some of the orthodox said he suffered in the humanity, his divinity did not suffer; others said he ‘suffered without suffering’. We must indeed sympathise with the Arab prophet who, having denied the divinity, considered God was so great and just that he could not abandon a Prophet and so good a man to his fate. He was not attacking Jesus; rather, the whole passage is in a context which suggests he is defending Jesus against the Jews. It was this same belief which sustained him in all his own sufferings as God’s

¹ 765 A. The oneness and singleness of God is of course a common-place in the Qur’ān. The rest of the paragraph may be in part a reflection of the teaching of Sura 4:189f., cf. also Sura 19:20ff. The two Marys are easily mixed up amongst people with little historical sense. Sometimes even the B. V. M. and the lady of Magdala become assimilated.

² Καὶ ὅτι οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι παρανομήσατες ἐθέλησαν αὐτὸν σταυρῶσαι, καὶ κρατήσατες ἐσταύρωσαν τὴν σκιὰν αὐτοῦ· αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Χριστός οὐκ ἐσταυρώθη, φησίν, οὐτε ἀτέθανεν· ὁ γὰρ θεός ἔλαβεν αὐτὸν πρὸς ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν διὰ τὸ φιλεῖν αὐτὸν (765 B).

³ Sura 4: 155f.

Apostle and Prophet. It was hardly possible for the Christian to point out that because Christ was a Son and God so loved, he allowed men to do as they wished, and what is more, that it was probably legal, so far as law could go. Our writer goes on to poke easy fun at the conversation between Jesus and Allah as reported by the Qur'an when Jesus got to Heaven¹. The Prophet, who had no small sense of humour, probably wrote it laughing himself. It is not the last time the argument that Jesus did not claim to be God but his followers did it for him, was to be used.

The Christian writer says that the Muslims cannot adduce witnesses for the giving by God of the Qur'an or for the prophecy of the coming of Muhammad. If this was true in his day, Islam has amply made up the defect. He also deals with another common Muslim accusation. They say the Christians are "Partnership Makers", they associate another with God². The writer answers the accusation from the Qur'an's own statement that Christ is the Word and Spirit; if he is outside God, then God is without Logos and Nous. In fact, in fearing to associate with God they become mutilators of God. This was a fine old patristic argument to bring out of the armoury, but it seems to have had little effect, for the Christians are to this day accused of "shirk", setting up others beside God.

To the accusation that Christians are idolaters for reverencing the cross, the writer retorts that the reverence for the Ka'ba at Mecca is much worse³. That rock is said by some of his opponents to be revered because Abraham tethered his camel there when about to sacrifice Isaac or because he had intercourse with Hagar upon it. It is said that one may discern a stone, a head of an Aphrodite which is what they in fact worship⁴. He then turns to ridicule the teaching of the Qur'an on marriage and divorce. He also refers to the incident of the Prophet causing his foster-son to divorce his wife with the aid of divine revelation, in due course to marry her himself⁵.

If a Christian is attempting to catch a Muslim out or is counter-attacking when the divinity of Christ is denigrated, he turns to the remnants of paganism spared by the Prophet when

¹ 765 B. Cf. Sura 5: 115f.

² 765 CD. 768 B.

³ 768 D, 769 A.

⁴ 769 B.

⁵ 769 B, C, D.

he reformed worship at the Ka'ba and he digs up the Prophet's private life after the death of Khadija. Obviously a Muslim can defend and explain, but it is at this point that in the past words merged into blows, or where today conversation breaks down. We are treading on some of Islam's holiest ground. At least the writer spares us a dissertation on the Prophet's treatment of political enemies and the Jews, once he had the political and military power to deal with them firmly. Perhaps as a man of his century he saw nothing abnormal in such treatment of enemies. We cannot expect him to put himself in the place of an Arab of his day and realise that the Prophet's regulations for divorce and the treatment of women were a great advance on the ways of the pagan Arabs. He turns once again to seek out the ridiculous. He treats at length a Muslim scripture which he calls "The Camel of God."¹ Titles such as this in this chapter usually refer to a Sura of the Qur'an, but there is no such Sura in the *Textus Receptus*. It is just possible that there was a recension with such a chapter heading which has not survived. There are in the Qur'an as we know it today references to a she-camel which correspond to parts of our writer's story². The writer enjoys making fun of a cautionary tale which had no doubt pleased the Arab mind and supplied morals. It concerns a she-camel which shared a water supply with some humans and provided them with milk. Evil men killed her and the baby-camel called out to God and was assumed. This leads him on to pour scorn on the Muslim picture of paradise, which remains a favourite theme in Christian attacks on Islam³.

The end of the chapter appears to be in confusion and it is probable that a fair amount of material has fallen out. The writer mentions the Sura called "The Table" in which Christ asked God for a table (of food) and was given an uncorruptible table, but he does not pursue the matter⁴. Possibly there was some discussion of the Eucharist. Then he mentions the Sura entitled "The Cow", and sets forth for ridicule the way in which, so he puts it, the Prophet ordered those with wives to be circumcised, he forbade sabbath-keeping and baptism, he allowed men to eat some things forbidden in the Law and told them to refrain from some things allowed; and he totally forbade the drinking of wine. Probably

¹ 772 A, B, 770 D.

² Suras 17: 61f., 26: 155ff., 54: 27f.

³ 772 B, C.

⁴ 772 D, Sura 5: 114.

the writer has no specific Qur'anic passages in mind¹; for instance, circumcision in Islam is an accepted custom rather than the following of a prophetic injunction. He is referring to Muslim practice as he knew it. But as is always the case with our writer, he does not see Islam as a religion in itself. At this point he visualises it as an arbitrary and whimsical picking and choosing from Judaism and Christianity. There is no rhyme or reason why the Prophet should keep one Jewish rite and reject another, or keep one Christian custom and refuse another. The writer implies that the Prophet concocted his heresy from an acquaintance with the Old and New Testaments and conversations with an Arian monk. Then he claimed he had received a Scripture out of heaven. It is true that the Prophet does not display thorough first-hand knowledge of "the Law" of the Jews and the "Gospel" of the Christians which he treats with such deep respect. It is true that he had a teacher who was probably a Christian and had had many early contacts with Christians. Some Arab tribes had been Christian a long time; Ethiopian and other kinds of Christianity had established themselves or were known in the peninsula; the Prophet himself had travelled abroad in Christian countries. Our writer takes it he knew Christianity well enough to pick and choose and be a heretic. Most modern scholars insist that Islam is a new religion and *sui generis*, therefore many tend to minimise the Prophet's knowledge of Christianity. Perhaps he knew a good deal, but the explosive power of the heavenly revelation which the writer says he claimed to have received and his own lack of formal and logical education, pushed his knowledge of Christianity to the edge of his thought where in itself it has little sense, but fits into the framework of his new religion.

It is worthy of note that our writer considers that Islam is a Christian heresy. As soon as it is so classed, the new religion is given a niche in a hoary and great tradition. It is true that Origen and others like him had tried to understand, to discuss and to win over their heretical opponents, but it was otherwise with the great heresiologists. For Hippolytus and even Irenaeus, refutation came before understanding. By Epiphanius' day the state was taking a hand. At the end of the fourth century, here-

¹ 772 D, 773 A. The possible Qur'anic references, among others, might be to Suras 2: 172f., and 5: 90.

tics suffered far worse fates than Jews or pagans. The orthodox state guided by the Church and prospered by Heaven would clear the earth of the heretics in the end. So the Arians within the Empire, and later outside it too, were overcome. It is possible to assert that the logical outcome of this way of thought would have been for St. John and his followers to have had no further dialogue with Islam but to have pinned their hope on a reassertion of Christian political power. Yet they were descended from the men who had opened the gates of Damascus to the Muslim, they were at that very time stoutly resisting the Byzantines over Iconoclasm. We may suppose that classifying Islam as a Christian heresy contributed something to the break-down of discussion. More probably political and social circumstances forced upon the Greek Fathers the acceptance of a kind of "apartheid", which remained the *status quo* even when the Turks replaced "the Saracens". Perhaps the Christians were assisted in putting up with subjugation by the place the Fathers found for Islam in the eschatological pattern, Islam is called the precursor of the anti-Christ, and so we may look forward to the End¹. The firm view of our writer that Islam is a Christian heresy does not at present appeal to most modern apologists, but when we come to a better understanding of the nature of heresy, we may be more prepared to accept this pointer towards an answer given us by the Fathers. It is possible that the Lord, the enlivening Holy Spirit, at some point spoke through this Prophet as he had spoken through others in the past, but because of the sins and omissions of many, not excluding many Churchmen, the movement took another direction. This same Spirit may be enabling us and our Muslim friends to pick up some of the threads where the Fathers and their Muslim contemporaries had decided there was little real hope of reconciliation².

¹ 764 A.

² The writer of this paper is indebted to Mr. Welch of Nottingham University for patiently supplying him over the years with photostats of texts otherwise inaccessible to him. He wishes also to acknowledge the help given so liberally through their writings and conversations by four Islamists who have visited him in Africa, Dr W. A. Bijlefeld, Dr Kenneth Cragg, Dr Joseph Schachte and Dr Humphrey Fisher. He is also indebted for many of the ideas reproduced above to a number of articles and books which he has read in the past but to which he has no access at present; chiefly, these are C. H. Becker: *Islamstudien* 1, 432–449, J. W. Voorhis, *Moslem World* 24, 392–398, J. W. Merrill in the same, 41, 88–97. These scholars and authors are not however to be held responsible for the use made of their ideas.

Acace, évêque de Césarée de Palestine, (341–365)

J.-M. LEROUX, Versailles

Cette courte communication n'a pas pour but de résoudre tous les problèmes attachés au rôle d'Acace dans la crise arienne. Son objectif, beaucoup plus modeste, est de montrer comment la prosopographie, avec sa technique objective, dépouillée de tout présupposé doctrinal, peut, en certain cas, imposer une révision des jugements traditionnels. A ce point de vue, Acace représente un cas privilégié, car il est considéré comme le chef de clan de la faction «homéenne», un Arien dur, peu ménagé par les historiens qui préfèrent accorder leur sympathie à son collègue Basile d'Ancyre. Et pourtant, le personnage d'Acace révélé par la prosopographie est bien différent du «portrait» traditionnel.

Acace, surnommé le «Borgne» (Jérôme, Vir. Inl. 98), est considéré par les historiens comme l'un des coryphées de l'Arianisme, sur la foi d'Athanase (De Syn. 12; ib. 38), alors que Sozomène (4,25) et Théodoret disent simplement qu'il était considéré comme «suspect» d'arianisme (2,31).

En réalité, malgré les nombreuses allusions à ce personnage dans les sources habituelles de cette époque, la vie d'Acace apparaît somme toute assez tranquille et l'historien doit porter un jugement nuancé sur son activité au sein des conflits doctrinaux du 4^e siècle.

Acace est mentionné pour la première fois au Concile des Encaenies (341) (Athanase, De Syn. 36; Soz., 3,5,10). Il y est compté parmi les personnalités en tant que successeur d'Eusèbe (Sozomène, 3,5,10), mais rien ne permet d'établir le rôle qu'il joua à ce concile.

On doit formuler la même réserve au sujet du concile de Sardique et de conciliabule de Philippopolis (343). Il fut présent à ce dernier concile (Hilaire, frgt. A IV 3) et signa la lettre synodal des Orientaux (Théodoret, 3,8; Mansi, 3,188 B); il fut également déposé à Sardique, au même titre que toutes les personne-

lités du clan oriental (Sozomène, 3,12,2; Théodore, 2,8; Hilaire, Excerpt. B II 37; Athanase, Epist. ad epp. Aeg., 7; Hist. Arian., 16; Hist. Arian., 28); mais tout permet de penser que cette mesure demeura sans effet, puisqu'on ne lui connaît aucun remplaçant et qu'il conserva paisiblement son siège (Théodore, 2,26,5). A partir de ce moment, et durant une période de quatorze ans, la vie d'Acace échappe presque complètement à l'histoire.

Évêque célèbre et cultivé (Sozomène, 3,2; 3,14,42; Jérôme, Vir. Inl. 98), son activité fut surtout intellectuelle et savante. Il entretint la bibliothèque de Césarée, que lui avait léguée Eusèbe (Sozomène, 4,23,2), la restaura et l'enrichit (Socrate, 2,4; Jérôme, Ep. 34,1). Il écrivit la vie d'Eusèbe (Socrate, 2,4) et quelques livres dont nous ne connaissons que de vagues fragments disséminés dans les œuvres de ses contemporains (Epiphane, Haer. 72,6,10; Jérôme, Ep. 119,6; Socrate, 2,4). Disciple d'Eusèbe Pamphile (Sozomène, 4,23,2; Athanase, De Synod. 13), il semble avoir adopté, du moins dans les premières années de son ministère, la même optique doctrinale que son maître, c'est-à-dire une doctrine qui pour n'être pas arienne, n'en était pas moins farouchement opposée à la formulation nicéenne et à la personnalité des tenants d'Athanase. On lui connaît en particulier une réfutation du libelle de Marcel d'Ancyre contre Astérius (Jérôme, Chron.).

Au cours de cette période, vraisemblablement vers 350, il dut consacrer Cyrille, évêque de Jérusalem, dans des circonstances mal élucidées (Théodore, 2,26,7); d'après Socrate (2,38) et Sozomène (4,20), Acace aurait participé à l'éviction de Maxime et à son remplacement par Cyrille. Par contre, son rôle dans l'élection de l'Antipape Félix, suggéré par Jérôme (Vir. Inl. 98), demeure particulièrement problématique. L'apparition d'Aèle et d'Eunome va infléchir sa position doctrinale sans pour autant la transformer. Mais surtout, les incidents survenus à la fin du règne de Constance provoquèrent l'entrée de cet intellectuel dans la lutte doctrinale où son attitude équivoque et brouillonne lui attireront les pires inimitiés (Photius, Bibl., 40).

Il assiste en 358 à un synode convoqué par Eudoxe pour s'opposer aux adversaires nicéens traditionnels, et surtout aux opinions émises par Basile d'Ancyre et quelques-uns de ses amis, jusque-là compagnons de lutte d'Acace (Sozomène, 4,12,4).

Peu après, l'Empereur convoque les conciles de Rimini et Séleucie (358). Acace va jouer au concile de Séleucie un rôle

de premier plan, s'attirant l'inimitié de tous par son astuce (*Philostorge*, 4,12). S'opposant à ceux qui veulent s'en tenir au symbole des Encaenies (*Sozomène*, 4,22,5–10; *Socrate*, 2,40), Acace veut concilier tout le monde en formulant un symbole inconsistant (*Sozomène*, 4,22,11), puis en se ralliant à la quatrième formule de Sirmium (*Athanase, De Syn.*, 29, *Socrate*, 2,4,40; *Sozomène*, 4,22) (*Epiphane, Panarion*, 73,26). Il surajoute à la question doctrinale sa volonté de déposer Cyrille devenu son ennemi mortel pour des questions de préséance (*Sozomène*, 4,22).

Déposé par le Concile (*Sozomène*, 4,22), Acace se rend à Constantinople avec ses amis et, faute de mieux, fait approuver la formule de Rimini (*Sozomène*, 4,24,2) et prononce la condamnation d'Aetios (*Sozomène*, 4,24,2; *Philostorge*, 5,1). Acace profite alors de son succès momentané pour faire exiler ses adversaires, qu'il s'agisse d'Eudoxe et d'Eunome (*Philostorge*, 5,2; 6,4) ou de ses rivaux de Séleucie (*Philostorge*, 5,1; *Théodoret*, 2,27; *Epiphane, Pan.*, 73). Il fait installer à leur place des évêques de son bord (*Sozomène*, 4,24; *Théodoret*, 5,27; *Socrate*, 2,4), en particulier Mélèce à Antioche (*Epiphane, Pan.*, 73,23–28). Athanase condamnera avec violence son attitude, lui reprochant avec véhémence de ne pas s'être maintenu dans le sillage doctrinal de son maître Eusèbe Pamphile, qui avait souscrit la formule de Nicée (*Athanase, De syn.*, 13,13).

Pourtant, c'est ce groupe d'évêques, qui, rassemblés en 363 à Antioche, à la demande de Mélèce, souscrit une profession de foi orthodoxe, signée par Acace (*Socrate*, 3,25; *Sozomène*, 6,4,4). D'autre part, Acace est déposé à Lampsaque en 365 par le clan macédonien (*Sozomène*, 6,7; *Socrate*, 4,4). A partir de cette date, on perd toute trace d'Acace, qui ne dut pas survivre longtemps à cette déposition.

Certains fragments de son œuvre conservés dans les chaines sont rassemblés par Staab, *Pauluskommentar*, pp. 53–56. Fragts. sur l'*Octateuque*, Rev. Bibl. 44, 1935, 186–189. Muséon 75, 1962, 331–355 contient un fragment inédit résumant la carrière d'Acace sans éléments nouveaux.

Que conclure? Rien ne permet d'accorder dans les faits à Acace la place de meneur qui lui est habituellement conférée. Son caractère l'a peut-être conduit à avoir à Séleucie une attitude regrettable; mais sa vie révèle plutôt un intellectuel fidèle à la tradition d'Antioche, persuadé par vanité qu'il avait l'envergure suffisante pour assurer l'unité, mais qui sut cependant créer

autour de sa personne un groupe d'amis qui rallièrent pour la plupart l'orthodoxie. Mais déjà, j'outrepasse les limites d'un exposé prosopographique. Un jour viendra, où, je l'espère, je pourrai produire une étude plus complète sur cet étrange personnage et sur son milieu.

La figura di Epifanio nel IV secolo

C. RIGGI, Roma

1. *La fama di E. in contrasto colle doti dello scrittore*

«La fama di Epifanio riempí la terra». Così si esprime presso i Ruteni la liturgia di S. Epifanio.

Già i suoi discepoli a Cipro gli dedicarono un tempio ed in esso l'immagine del Santo spiccava fra tutte le altre¹.

Sozomeno² racconta che già alla sua morte egli godeva fama di profeta e di taumaturgo e che al suo sepolcro venivano portati per ricevere la guarigione indemoniati ed ammalati.

Ma già durante la sua vita, fin dagli inizi del suo episcopato, l'epistola di Acacio e Paolo lo riconosceva famoso in tutto il mondo quale «araldo di verità . . . nuovo Giovanni Battista»³. S. Gerolamo⁴ fa notare come in tempi di persecuzione universale da parte degli Ariani, Epifanio, sia come presbitero del suo monastero sia come vescovo di Cipro, poté per il suo indiscusso ascendente rimanere indisturbato: . . . *a Valente non tangebatur. Tantae enim venerationis semper fuit ut regnantes haeretici ignoraminam suam putarent si talem virum prosequerentur.* Nella persecuzione antinicena di Costanzo rimase indisturbato, anzi poté far visita ad Eusebio di Vercelli, esiliato a Scitopoli e favorire Lucifero di Cagliari, esiliato ad Eleuteropoli, quando *Ioannes* (il suo vescovo semiariano!) *occidentalibus et in medio exilio confessoribus, SS. Dionysio Mediolanensi, Eusebio Vercellensi et Lucifero Calaritano, non communicabat*⁵. Costanzo «sospettoso e accentratore . . . aspro e implacabile . . . fervente e intollerante cristiano» che richiama al Paribeni⁶ la triste e solitaria altergia e le altre doti buone e cattive d'un Luigi XI di Francia e d'un

¹ PG 41/115.

² Hist eccl. GCS 50/342 ss. VII, 27.

³ GCS 25/154.

⁴ Contra Joannem Hierosolymitanum ad Pammachium I, 4. PL 23/358–359.

⁵ S. Ger. ibidem.

⁶ Da Diocleziano alla caduta dell'imp. d'occ. p. 120.

Filippo II di Spagna, mentre non si astenne dal perseguitare Atanasio, dovette rimanere preso dal fascino dell'asceta Epifanio. E questi infatti nell'articolo contro gli Ariomaniti si mostra favorevole a Costanzo, «mitte e buono, degno figlio del pio e santo Costantino». Ai vescovi indegni sarebbero, secondo Epifanio, da imputare le stragi e gli esili che i cattolici subirono sotto Costanzo¹.

La fama di Epifanio continuò ad essere grande per il fascino della sua figura di asceta e di carismatico, per la santità della sua vita e per la purità della sua fede e permise che ci fosse conservata in massima parte la sua opera di scrittore. Fin dai tempi di S. Gerolamo i suoi libri andavano a ruba: . . . *ab eruditis propter res, a simplicioribus propter verba*².

Il giudizio sugli scritti di Epifanio non è oggetto di problematica.

Aimé Puech afferma che il Panarion è un lavoro colossale che si impone al rispetto di ogni critica, ma che fa solo desiderare un'intelligenza più solida³. L'Opera di Epifanio infatti è una miniera di notizie utili allo storico, sempre più utili man mano che le dottrine esposte sono più vicine ai suoi tempi. Egli per allargare le sue ricerche si è servito di documenti diretti che soltanto da lui ci sono tramandati. Le notizie utilizzate per via orale, i giudizi sui suoi contemporanei vanno certo passati al vaglio della critica. Alcune notizie del Panarion sono di fonte manualistica come p. es. quelle estremamente superficiali sulla filosofia greca; la *diadoché* è priva di un vero senso della storia. Ma è ingiusto non riconoscergli da una parte una certa originalità anche quando si ispira ad altri⁴, d'altra parte una sincerità ed imparzialità programmatica, anche quando parla di certi nemici della ortodossia quali un Apollinare, un Marcello d'Ancira, un Audio. Egli dichiara buona volontà di storico⁵, ma non ne ha le doti. Pare portato ad esagerare, a travisare e persino a mistificare: ma è un vezzo purtroppo comune a gran parte dei controversisti!

Quando lo si giudichi da un punto di visto letterario, il giudizio non può che essere negativo.

¹ Haer. 89,12. GCS 37/162–163.

² Ger. De scriptoribus, CXIV, ed. Teubner, p. 60.

³ A. Puech, Histoire de la littérature grecque chrétienne, III, 1930, p. 654.

⁴ Cfr. p. es. Haer. 24, 8. GCS 25/26 ss.

⁵ Haer. 68, 1–2.

La sua scienza filologica ci fa sorridere! Il suo è il linguaggio parlato, una *Koiné* quale era cominciata ad apparire nella letteratura greca con Polibio, con morfologia fluttuante, con sintassi incerta, con un lessico ricco di sviluppi decadenti.

«L'ordre et la clarté ne sont pas les principales qualités de son exposé.»¹ Ciò che di positivo si può dire sullo stile di Epifanio è che non manca un certo «calore comunicativo»² e che spesso ironizza in maniera vivace ed in termini talora originali. Ma spesso la frase è stentata e l'ironia volgare. Secondo il Puech l'Ancorato ha qualche sincerità di accento³. Se però nell'Ancorato possiamo notare una certa ombra di liricità, nel Panarion mi pare di vedere un senso epico di eroica missione; come in un'immensa tragedia biblica il dionisiaco motivo del serpente domina stranamente, banalmente retorico, ma non manca una certa arcaica poesia: la vera unità estetica è nella dominatrice figura di Epifanio, eroico e gigantesco lottatore contro la ferocia di svariati mostri (la fonte del nostro forse è comune a quella del «Fisiologo» medievale!), con quel sovrano distacco, proprio di chi guarda anche le deviazioni più abominevoli dalla verità e dalla natura, con l'occhio sereno di Dio, con ariostesca ironia. Egli è il vero protagonista, il campione della verità e della fede, contro tutti gli errori ereticali che egli vede incarnati nei più mostruosi serpenti. Ricorre sovente trionfale e sprezzante l'invettiva di bruto, d'animale senza ragione o di volgare commediante, d'attore tragico da strapazzo, di gente che maschera il volto della verità. Tali condanne in formule sempre virulente e rozze si susseguono con arcaica semplicità come le cadenze di un'immensa sinfonia tragica in 80 tempi di cui l'Ancorato è come l'ouverture.

2. *Le due grandi accuse: ingegno estremamente limitato e zelo esasperatamente fanatico*

Su quanto ho detto sopra la critica antica e recente in fondo è d'accordo: non così sul giudizio che si dà della sua figura intellettuale e della sua condotta politica, sul valore delle sue impostazioni teologiche e sulla razionalità dei suoi gesti diplomatici.

¹ A. Puech, l. c. p. 650.

² A. Puech, l. c. p. 652.

³ l. c. p. 652.

I documenti che possono far luce sulla problematica di Epifanio sono pochi: soprattutto i suoi scritti e quelli di S. Gerolamo. La biografia scritta sotto i falsi nomi di Giovanni e di Polibio, edita da Petau e da Dindorf, è evidentemente leggendaria. Gli *Acta S. Epiphanii, auctore R. P. Dan. Papebrochio*¹ sono aderenti alle norme di una critica storica già adulta, ma in qualche punto oggi debbono essere corretti alla luce di nuovi studi posteriori².

Già Melantone aveva notato che non solo le sue notizie sono *negligenter perscriptae* ma anche la sua teologia è *omnino languidior*³.

Il Diels⁴ così esprimeva negativamente il suo giudizio: «*Nisi sciremus quarto saeculo eius Panaria conscripta esse, de Byzantinorum vel, si mirificos errores spectas, Arabum fetu cogitandum erat. Usque eo omnia in meras nugas conversa sunt . . . Frustra te crucies, quid tandem baronis istius cerebello talia commiscendi causam dederit. Nec hercule operae praetium est!*»

I critici posteriori che hanno toccato anche tangenzialmente l'argomento, hanno dato in termini più o meno sfumati lo stesso giudizio. La mente del vescovo di Salamina sarebbe incapace di una comprensione piena della complessa e vasta dottrina che egli tratta nelle sue opere; egli non avrebbe avuto chiarezza di prospettiva teologica e sarebbe stato negato alla speculazione. Inoltre sarebbe stato incapace di dominare non solo i mezzi espressivi, ma anche la materia trattata.

Ma l'accusa di fanatismo antiereticale è quella che oggi più grava sul nome di Epifanio. La figura di Epifanio sarebbe degna di essere studiata come un caso patologico di un prevalere del suo zelo sull'intelligenza!

Jean Steinmann nella sua monografia su Gerolamo⁵ intitola ad Epifanio un capitolo con queste parole significative: «*Les gaffes de Saint Éphphane*». Ed ecco con che brio si prende gioco del Santo: «*Solennel, sûr de lui, peu doué du côté de l'intelligence, il se prenait pour l'orthodoxie incarnée. Une telle certitude est grisante. Sa nouvelle manie était l'origénisme.*»

¹ PG 41/113–152.

² Mi pare p. es. grottesca la spiegazione del Papebroch sull'episodio del gesto iconoclasta di Epifanio: egli avrebbe strappata l'immagine di una persona profana o di una persona vivente che rappresentava quella del Cristo!

³ C. R. 1/1110 e 1112, cfr. PG 41/IV.

⁴ Doxographi Graeci, Berlin 1879, p. 175.

⁵ Saint Jérôme, Paris 1958, 243–246.

Francis Murphy nella sua vita di Rufino d'Aquileia¹ lo dice «of considerable, but undigested erudition, joining a certain narrowness of outlook and singleness of purpose to an indisputable piety . . . for whom Origenism and its devotees were to become an obsession!» Il Murphy non fa che ripetere il giudizio del Cavallera: «D'une érudition étendue, mais assez indigeste, il alliait parfois une certaine étroitesse d'esprit à une pureté d'intention et à une piété indiscutables.»²

Al Cavallera soprattutto si rifanno in fondo gli studiosi moderni nei loro giudizi piuttosto negativi sul santo di Salamina: l'illustre studioso dello scisma d'Antiochia e della vita di S. Gerolamo si è incontrato spesso con Epifanio e non si è reso ben conto del suo atteggiamento nei riguardi di S. Melezio, di cui tutti i vescovi orientali a specialmente il grande S. Basilio erano fautori, e nei confronti di S. Giovanni Crisostomo, che proteggeva i «Macro-delfi» accusati di origenismo. Egli accusa Epifanio di assoluta mancanza di discernimento; Epifanio si sarebbe ingannato soprattutto nel condannare Origene, non soltanto perché irretito della diabolica astuzia di Teofilo, ma anche perché non si era nutrito abbastanza, come gli altri grandi Padri ortodossi, di Origene: ecco perché nella «zoologie quelque peu infantine» del Panarion aveva avuto posto il grande luminare del didascaleion alessandrino; ecco spiegato, secondo il Cavallera, lo strano comportamento di Epifanio nella questione origenista alla fine del IV secolo³.

D. Amand⁴ scrive seguendo la critica del Cavallera: «Incarnò alla perfezione il tipo dello zelante fanatico . . . il suo spirito torbido ed inquieto lo spinse a posizioni infelici per cui invece di portare la pace, rese concrenose le divisioni». Per il P. Amand il campione dell'antiorigenismo non poteva non essere che un «esprit brouillon et inquiet» (!) per cui la lotta per l'ortodossia era un'espressione subcosciente de «la violence de son temperament».

Per lo Steinmann si tratta addirittura di una mania! Sarebbe stato il vescovo di Salamina ad «aprire il processo» dell'origenismo. «On lui souffla à l'oreille qu'Origène était le père d'Arius. Il y avait

¹ F. X. Murphy, *Rufinus of Aquileia (345–411). His Life and Works*, Washington 1949, p. 66.

² S. Jérôme, *Sa vie et son œuvre*, Louvain 1922, p. 203.

³ Cavallera, *Saint Jérôme etc.*, passim.

⁴ D. Amand, *Fatalisme et liberté dans l'antiquité grecque*, Parigi Lovanio 1945, p. 442.

de quoi mettre le feu aux poudres.» Con stile divertito lo Steinmann ci descrive Epifanio a passare di gaffe in gaffe . . . quando egli faceva pregare per la conversione del vescovo di Gerusalemme nella stessa diocesi di lui, quando lo dichiarava eretico provocando imprudentemente lo scisma, quando «saisi d'une crise d'iconoclasme» lacerava il dipinto con l'immagine del Cristo¹!

Anche il Padre de Labriolle parla di «un'atmosphère d'orages» provocata da Epifanio. «Il s'assigna pour tâche de perdre Origène dans l'opinion catholique. A qui douterait encore que l'érudition la plus étendue puisse s'allier dans le même esprit avec une réelle médiocrité d'intelligence et les partis-pris les plus entêtés, on pourrait présenter Epiphane comme un spécimen assez réussi de ce déplaisant amalgame. C'était personnellement un homme d'une piété édifiante et d'une vie digne de respect, mais tout brûlant d'un zèle passablement brouillon, il s'était constitué chasseur d'hérésies et il avait flairé en l'origénisme une proie magnifique.»²

Non mancarono però in tempi antichi e recenti dei giudizi positivi.

Il Brochet³ p. es. già dal 1905 lodava Epifanio in questi termini. Dopo la tormenta ariana che assorbì l'attenzione di tutta la cristianità, Origene occupa il primo posto nel pensiero cristiano; ma, se resta per l'erudizione sacra il modello e la fonte di ogni scienza, riguardo alla fede per i credenti allarmati dal rischio che la Chiesa ha corso, egli è divenuto il principio ed il maestro della eresia . . . Il Brochet ammira quindi la tenacia di Epifanio nel continuare la lotta all'origenismo anche quando, rientrato in Cipro, dovette restare solo «a portare il peso del risentimento di Rufino e della collera di Giovanni di Gerusalemme»; sottolinea l'intelligenza di Epifanio quando nella lettera aperta a Giovanni⁴ seppe toccare i punti giusti della questione ponendola in termini di ineluttabile precisione davanti all'opinione pubblica; deplora la condotta di Giovanni «âme faible, mesquine, irascibile, âprement jalouse de son autorité».

Roger Tandonnet⁵ loda nel metropolita di Cipro una moderazione e una comprensione ben superiore a quella di Gerolamo;

¹ J. Steinmann, *Saint Jérôme*, Paris 1958. 243–246.

² *Hist de l'église* di Fliche-Martin, vol. IV, p. 33.

³ S. Jérôme et ses ennemis. Étude sur la querelle de S. Jérôme avec Rufin d'Aquilée et sur l'ensemble de son œuvre polémique, Paris 1906, pp. 123–126

⁴ Ger. Ep. 51. CSEL 54/395–412.

⁵ Dict. de spiritualité, s. v. Epiphane.

loda il polemista così fecondo di opere e l'eresiologo così riccamente esaurente nelle sue trattazioni e che pur sentì modestamente i suoi limiti. Originale soprattutto il giudizio del Tandonnet sullo spirito di equilibrio di Epifanio: «c'est une justice que l'on rend rarement à Épiphane!» Egli afferma ancora: «Il est difficile, pourtant, de parler d'intolerance systématique de la part d'Épiphane — le cas d'Origène mis à part, peut-être — encore que l'on puisse parler d'incompréhensions multiples, de méconnaissance de certaines valeurs positives chez l'ennemi»¹.

I giudizi favorevoli come quelle citati del Brochet e del Tandonnet, sono però un'eccezione nella critica storica più recente.

Pierre Nautin in un suo recente articolo impegnativo², chiude presentando la figura del vescovo di Salamina come un problema sconcertante di componenti stranamente contraddittorie: «En fait Épiphane apparaît totalement étranger à la paideia classique et constitue, à cet égard, un'exception unique parmi les grands écrivains de ce temps. Nous ne nous rendrons pas juges de sa sainteté. Du moins était-il un ascète. Il en avait le physique impressionnant, . . . aussi la psychologie, avec ses qualités, la conviction ardente, la force d'âme, et avec ses défauts trop fréquents, qui s'accentuèrent avec l'âge, comme les jugements sommaires et définitifs, les partis pris, la facilité à s'aveugler sur soi et sur les autres au point de mettre au compte de l'amour de la vérité ce qui était pour une grande part du ressentiment, et de se tromper entre un Théophile et un Jean Chrysostome.» Lo studioso si rifà anche lui «au cas d'Origène» che il Tandonnet invece confessa di non sapere spiegare.

Il «caso d'Origene» oggi alla luce degli studi più recenti non è più uno motivo che ci possa far giudicare l'ingegno di Epifanio estremamente limitato ed il suo zelo pazzamente fanatico.

3. *L'antiorigenismo di Epifanio non fu una mania*

Il Cavallera aveva riconosciuto «impossible de trouver dans la littérature ecclésiastique de cette époque, en dehors de la polémique d'Épiphane, puis de Théophile et de S. Jérôme, trace notable d'erreurs origénistes exposées et défendues systémati-

¹ Dict. de spir. s. v. E. col. 857.

² Dict. d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques diretto da R. Aubert, Van Cauwenbergh, Paris, s. v. Épiphane de Salamine.

quement, soit en Orient, soit à plus forte raison en Occident» . . . perciò l'origenismo sarebbe stato nient'altro che un «épouventail» macchinato dall'astuta politica di Teofilo, a cui avrebbe creduto la innocente «stupidità» di Epifanio. Perciò lo Steinmann considerò semplicione anche Gerolamo perché si sarebbe fatto ingannare da Epifanio per la cieca fiducia e devozione che aveva per lui¹ ed il Lazzati² risolve tutta la questione origenista del IV secolo riportandone la responsabilità fondamentale su Teofilo d'Alessandria³. Perciò l'Altaner ascrisse a prova di mancanza di misura in Epifanio «da sua lotta cieca contro l'origenismo»⁴.

Ma l'origenismo dei tempi di Epifanio era tutt'altro che uno spauracchio! Lo ha dimostrato esaurientemente lo studio recentissimo di Antonio Guillaumont nella sua interpretazione dei *Kephalaia Gnostica* e nella sua storia dell'origenismo greco-siriaco nel IV secolo, la quale indirettamente pone le basi ad una revisione del giudizio sulla condotta di Epifanio nella questione origenista e per conseguenza su tutta la vita del santo. Credo infatti che la critica negativa del Cavallera e degli studiosi che a lui si rifanno, sia come contaminata dal pregiudizio della mania antiorigenista attribuita al Santo; dal giudizio di mania antiorigenista si è facilmente passati a quello di mania antiariana, antigostica ecc.⁵

Il Guillaumont lamenta che finora si sia concesso volentieri ad Epifanio l'erudizione ed un eminente tenore di vita ascetica ma si siano fatte troppe riserve per le sue doti di intelligenza e di intuito pratico! Ed invero gli si è fatto torto a mettere in tanto rilievo per il «caso di Origene» come un amalgama strano di cocciutaggine e di debolezza, di semplicità e di tatticismo, di durezza aggressiva e di dolcezza pastorale, di partito preso e di cedimenti repentini. Se n'è fatto come un caso patologico, come di un susseguirsi di parossismi e di lucidi intervalli in un temperamento maniaco, soprattutto perché non si è vista nessuna giustificazione razionale del suo operato in un pericolo reale ed immi-

¹ l. c. p. 246.

² Teofilo p. 7 segg.

³ «quello spirto di uomo di mondo pratico di affari e di uomo politico che fece di lui più un prefetto che un vescovo.»

⁴ Patrologia p. 227 della trad. it.

⁵ Così p. es. il Cavallera trattando dello scisma di Antiochia ironizza su Epifanio che nessuno poteva sospettare «de tiédeur pour l'orthodoxie» (l. c. p. 314), «un orthodoxe . . . aussi intractable» lo aveva detto prima, p. 198.

nente all'ortodossia. Epifanio fu un carattere irruente, non patologico! La fama che egli godette di asceta coerente che sapeva alternare il rigore del monaco con la carità del vescovo dovette essere ben fondata. Il favore che godeva S. Giovanni Crisostomo e l'odiosità della figura di Teofilo credo abbiano suscitato nella memoria dei posteri la simpatia per i «Fratelli Lunghi» protetti dal Crisostomo e perseguitati da Teofilo. Mi pare d'altra parte che gli antichi storici, quali un Palladio, un Socrate ed un Sozomeno, abbiano voluto troppo giustificare i monaci originisti che presentano come i campioni illuminati contro la rozza eresia degli antropomorfiti.

I *Kephalaia Gnostica* di Evagrio¹ ci dimostrano la verità delle parole che Epifanio fin dal 377 scrisse² contro gli errori di Origene. L'eresia si era sviluppata veramente «dapprima nei paesi d'Egitto» e ai tempi d'Epifanio era «abbracciata da persone eminentissime (*εξοχώτατοι*) di vita ascetica». La testimonianza di Epifanio, secondo il Guillaumont, potrebbe riguardare i «Lunghi», e preciserebbe i fatti avvenuti attorno alla grande figura di Ammonio. Ad ogni modo rimane indiscusso che già fin dall'inizio del secolo IV, prima della venuta di Evagrio, l'originismo permeò la Chiesa d'Egitto nei suoi membri migliori e che Epifanio ebbe le sue buone ragioni per scagliarsi sia contro il vescovo di Gerusalemme sia contro i seguaci dell'antropomorfismo. Nella lotta portò tutto il suo spirito di zelo irruente: ma quanto Gerolamo³ ci narra sulla condotta di Epifanio nei rapporti di Giovanni di Gerusalemme e sull'episodio del velo dipinto lacerato dal Santo, ha una sua piena giustificazione. Non mi pare sia più il caso di ripetere le accuse di fanatismo religioso o di mania antieretica! Certo non si può più parlare di follia antioriginista!

L'opera di Evagrio è, secondo il Guillaumont, «una testimonianza unica dell'originismo dei monaci di Nitria», ma non è la sola testimonianza dell'originismo. Epifanio, a me pare, si può considerare come il testimonio d'un originismo popolare. Egli nell'Ancorato⁴ combatte l'errore fondamentale sulla resurrezione della carne; nell'Eresia 64⁵ combatte anche gli errori sulla

¹ A. Guillaumont, *Les six centuries des Kephalaia gnostica d'Évagre le Pontique*.

² Haer. 64. GCS 31/403 segg.

³ Ep. 51. PL 22/517 ss. CSEL 54/395-412.

⁴ GCS 25/5 ss.

⁵ GCS 31/403 ss.

preesistenza delle anime e sulla loro caduta (i corpi sarebbero . . . le tuniche di pelle!): entrambi gli scritti ci mostrano quanto fosse attuale l'eresia già dal 374, soprattutto quanto fosse ritenuto pericoloso per la fede negli ambienti cristiani il negare la resurrezione della carne. Non credo che abbia ragione il Guillaumont quando afferma che Epifanio avrebbe insistito su quest'errore perché attingeva a Metodio: in tutta l'opera del santo vescovo di Cipro la preoccupazione di difendere questo punto del dogma cattolico è continua.

Il capitolo del Panarion ci informa molto poco sulle idee dello origenismo Evagriano e la lettera di Epifanio a Giovanni di Gerusalemme, che fu scritta 20 anni dopo¹, non ci dà altri particolari sull'eresia dotta. Epifanio avrà probabilmente conosciuto l'origenismo fin dai tempi della sua educazione nel monastero egiziano; fin d'allora dovette concepire un odio mortale contro gli errori che più si opponevano alla fede nella Redenzione: per lui Origene negava col suo subordinazionismo il fondamento della Redenzione, con la sua concezione delle «tuniche di pelle» il fondamento della speranza cristiana. Credo abbia attinto direttamente alle opere di Origene, pur senza approfondirle. Sozomeno² racconta che Ammonio, nell'intervista dei «Lunghi» ad Epifanio, gli avrebbe domandato: «Ma tu per caso ti sei mai incontrato con qualcuno dei nostri discepoli? Hai letto qualcuno dei nostri libri?» Alla risposta negativa di Epifanio, avrebbe così incalzato: «Su quale argomento allora ti fondi per giudicarci eretici?» Epifanio avrebbe risposto con semplicioneria che le sue informazioni erano di seconda mano, per sentito dire! Credo che l'informazione di Sozomeno sia uno sviluppo fantastico e polemico della fama che godeva il santo di non interessarsi alla confutazione dell'origenismo dotto; allo spirito poco speculativo di Epifanio bastava sapere che l'origenismo insidava alla fede della Chiesa nei punti più essenziali per condannarlo! Invece Rufino³ attesta che Epifanio si sarebbe vantato d'aver letti i suoi 6.000 volumi! Bisogna dunque accusare Epifanio di falsità flagrante? La vanteria di Epifanio è affermata da un origenista, nella polemica più acre e più esasperata, quindi è da prendere anch'essa con beneficio d'inventario! Probabilmente Epifanio avrà detto di conoscere i

¹ Ep. 51 l. c. PL 22/517 CSEL 54/335–412.

² Hist. Eccl. 8, 15. GCS 50/369.

³ Rufinus, De adulteratione librorum Origenis c. 15. Corpus Christianorum, series latina 20, p. 16.

libri di Origene: non ne segue che abbia affermato di averli letti tutti o di averli studiati! La verità può stare anche questa volta nel mezzo! D'altra parte tutti sanno quanto poco attendibili siano le affermazioni fatte in tali polemiche!

Certo nella polemica antiorigenistica di Epifanio molti suoi gesti rimangono inspiegabili. Soprattutto si rimane sconcertati al pensiero che un personaggio così venerato da tutta la cattolicità, fra il partito del Crisostomo e quello di Teofilo, si sia schierato nettamente per il secondo; che alla fine chissà per quale misterioso motivo abbia lasciato il campo di battaglia a Costantinopoli, per tornarsene repentinamente alla sua Salamina. Ma oggi forse è venuto il momento di sdrammatizzare «il caso di Origene». S. Giovanni Crisostomo rimaneva per Epifanio una creatura di Melezio e di Flaviano, i quali, ai suoi occhi di intransigente campione dell'ortodossia nicena, erano i rappresentanti di quell'indirizzo tatticista semiariano, contro il quale aveva combattuto da tanti anni; ora Giovanni a Costantinopoli accoglieva gli uomini più eminenti dell'origenismo... Quale meraviglia se un uomo del carattere di Epifanio sospettasse del Crisostomo? D'altra parte se Teofilo d'Alessandria, il subdolo fondatore della supremazia religioso-politica del suo etnarcato¹, si rese odioso ai contemporanei ed ai posteri, per Epifanio rimaneva pur sempre il metropolita d'Alessandria, il successore di Atanasio e per conseguenza il difensore dell'ortodossia! La conversione tattica di Teofilo all'antiorigenismo poteva apparire ai suoi occhi come un felice ritorno alla tradizione ortodossa, al punto da fargli completamente dimenticare gli attacchi precedentemente subiti! Per Epifanio le questioni personali non contano. Nella lettera a Giovanni di Gerusalemme lo protesta altamente: «Origene non mi ha rubato niente! Non è un mio contemporaneo, perciò non mi ha spinto ad odiarlo ed a combatterlo nessun interesse terreno; non aspiro alla sua eredità!»²

L'immediata partenza da Costantinopoli può essere attribuita a cause molteplici; non abbiamo purtroppo notizie fondate che ci documentino. Ma la spiegazione del brusco cambiamento di scena può trovarsi in altre cause che non siano la stranezza del suo carattere. Può darsi che la politica evangelica dell'est est, non non³ lo abbia indotto a lasciare immediatamente quell'am-

¹ cfr. Lazzati, l. c.

² CSEL 54/406.

³ Haer. 19,6. GCS 25/223.

biente partigiano ed infido, appena si sia reso conto della realtà... Del resto mi pare che Epifanio non abbia mai partecipato volentieri alle assisi ecclesiastiche che con tanta frequenza si susseguirono durante il suo lungo episcopato; il suo nome non compare neanche nel concilio ecumenico costantinopolitano I: egli odiava le disquisizioni teologiche!

4. L'intransigenza d'Epifanio nella questione dello scisma Antiocheno

Come nella questione origenista nocquero all'estimazione di Epifanio la simpatia dei posteri per il dolce S. Giovanni Crisostomo e l'odiosità universale per il teocrate Teofilo, così nella questione precedente dello scisma d'Antiochia mi pare abbiano nociuto parimenti alla fama di Epifanio il fascino che ebbe presso i posteri il grande Basilio di Cappadocia e la disistima in cui fu presso di tutti gli orientali Paolino d'Antiochia. Noi oggi siamo ben lontani dal disapprovare la condotta di Basilio! Ma la condotta di Epifanio, rappresentante principale dell'estrema destra, mi pare logicamente intransigente e non un'espressione d'un suo zelo irrazionale. Preoccupazione preminente di Epifanio era la purità della fede; l'unità della Chiesa per la sua intelligenza limitata non poteva ottenersi senza che prima trionfasse la verità. Non che egli ignorasse che molte divisioni apparentemente dottrinali fossero in realtà soprattutto politiche! Ma il punto di partenza per il nostro asceta intransigente era un precedente incontro nella fede, mentre per la saggia «economia» di Basilio era un precedente incontro nella carità.

La sua coerenza lo portò all'isolamento. Paolino fra i suoi colleghi orientali aveva ben pochi partigiani. «Non si conoscono altri nomi al di fuori di Diodoro di Tiro e di S. Epifanio.»¹ Ma l'occidente non riconosceva Paolino?

Mi pare che Epifanio nella sua posizione filoromana nei riguardi dello scisma d'Antiochia segni un passo avanti nell'evoluzione della dottrina ecclesiastica sul primato di Petro.

Egli nei Suoi scritti ripete gli argomenti tradizionali, che ha appresi dal suo maestro Ireneo: «S. Pietro, pur avendo rinnegato un tempo il Signore, fu fatto capo supremo (*κορυφαίτατος*) degli

¹ Cfr. Cavallera, *Le schisme d'Antioche*, p. 22.

apostoli, vera solida pietra che costituisce il fondamento della fede (*θεμελιοῦσα τὴν πίστιν*), sulla quale é stata fabbricata la Chiesa . . .»¹. Per la sua fede Pietro ebbe assegnato il primo posto della gerarchia; il Signore, che conosce i cuori nelle più intime pieghe, vide che Pietro era degno del primo posto e Lo «scelse come capo (*ἀρχηγός* = lo si dice del Cristo) dei Suoi fedeli»². E la Chiesa è una come è una la fede³. Ora nella questione dello scisma Antiocheno Epifanio sarà stato spinto dal suo oltranzismo ortodosso ad identificare la fede di Pietro con la fede del Pontefice Romano?

Nel IV secolo il primato di Pietro già cominciava ad essere identificato col primato del vescovo di Roma; ma credo che Epifanio fosse portato soprattutto da motivi polemici a sentire il primato di Roma come la pietra di paragone della vera fede. Pur ammirando la virtù di Melezio, «tanto stimato ed amato specialmente per la fama della sua dirittura morale oltre che per la fede ortodossa dei suoi fedeli» formulava contro di lui gravi accuse⁴. Per l'intransigente filoniceno soltanto Paolino era il rappresentante genuino dell'ortodossia perché questi si rifaceva alla fede di S. Eustazio, l'avversario più in vista di Ario; Paolino poi era in comunione con Roma e con Alessandria! Epifanio, nemico di ogni compromesso, combatterà ogni formula omeusiana od omea e sconfessava chiunque tentasse di camuffare la verità. La lotta con Melezio lo portò a Roma nel 382⁵ insieme a Paolino e probabilmente insieme a Timoteo d'Alessandria per ottenere da papa Damaso una decisione favorevole agli Eustaziani: fu un suo alleato Ambrogio, l'assettore del primato romano. Forse la politica romana in quel caso non fu opportuna, come non lo era stato precedentemente quando il papa aveva negata la comunione a Melezio per darla a Paolino; ma Epifanio guardava in questa occasione a papa Damaso come precedentemente Atanasio aveva guardato a papa Giulio.

Per Epifanio l'imperativo categorico era il trionfo della fede nell'unità della Chiesa⁶; la Chiesa cattolica è unica via di verità⁷,

¹ Haer. 59, 7. GCS 31/372.

² Haer. 51, 17. GCS 31/273 seg.

³ De fide, 6. GCS 37/501 ss.

⁴ Haer. 73, 34–35. GCS 37/309–310.

⁵ CSEL 56/150.

⁶ Haer. 61, 2. GCS 31/382.

⁷ Haer. 59, 12. GCS 31/378.

sola sposa di Cristo¹, legittima detentrice dei misteri²; nella chiesa tutti i cristiani diversificati nella loro vocazione individuale sono unificati dalla gerarchia, che ha il suo fondamento nella fede di Pietro. Gli fu cara l'immagine dell'imbarcazione in cui tutti hanno il proprio ufficio³. Il suo concetto di Chiesa è di una vastità sorprendente; l'idea di cattolicità supera ogni delimitazione spazio-temporale: dai tempi di Adamo fino alla fine dei tempi la fede costituisce l'essenza della Chiesa cattolica a cui si oppongono tutte le eresie, le quali non sono altro che aberrazioni dalla fede sia tra circoncisi che tra idolatri⁴.

5. La condotta di Epifanio nella questione della Pasqua

Egli che fu così intransigente e polemico per quanto riguardava i fondamenti della fede, sembra però sia stato straordinariamente comprensivo ed elastico in quello che riguardava le questioni pratiche della tradizione ecclesiastica.

Tipica è la sua posizione nella questione della Pasqua, che per una seconda volta agitò la Chiesa nel IV secolo. Il vescovo di Salamina, che sempre aveva aderito all'ortodossia nicena ed era stato sempre tenace sostenitore delle tesi occidentali ed alessandrine, questa volta si schierava contro l'uso imposto dal concilio di Nicea e prendeva netta posizione contro la tradizione festale di Alessandria e di Roma⁵. La decisione di Nicea proibiva di fissare la Pasqua alla domenica susseguente il plenilunio di Nisan (poichè il mese di Nisan cadeva in epoca differente) e determinava di celebrarla la domenica susseguente al plenilunio di primavera; ma gli Antiocheni e tutta la diocesi politica d'Oriente facevano viva resistenza all'innovazione, nè Epifanio credette opportuno contrariare i fedeli di Cipro. Fu prudente e coerente tale condotta? Certo dovette difenderla con quel suo carattere poco sfumato e che non conosceva le mezze misure, se ad un certo punto Atanasio dovette consigliarlo a smettere le sue critiche⁶: noi non sappiamo quale sia stata la reazione all'invito di «papa Atanasio».

¹ Haer. 35, 3. GCS 31/43.

² Haer. 73, 31; 61,6. GCS 37/305–306; GCS 31/386–387.

³ Haer. 61,3. segg. GCS 31/382 segg.

⁴ Cfr. Haer. 1,4. GCS 25/173; Haer. 2,4 seg. GCS 25/174 seg. ecc.

⁵ Cfr. Teodoreto, Ep. I, IX, 12; Socrate, Hist. Eccl. I, IX.

⁶ PG 92, 76 C.

Questa posizione antinicena del campione di Nicea non può non sorprendere; pare come un episodio staccato e isolato della sua vita. Ma credo che possa essere giudicata prudente e coerente se si concede ad Epifanio un orizzonte meno limitato. Amo pensare che egli abbia voluto in questo caso trattenere gli occidentali dal prendere misure severe che avrebbero potuto suscitare scismi; forse avrà voluto imitare la prudente condotta che Ireneo aveva tenuta nel dissuadere papa Vittore dallo scomunicare gli Asiatici quartadecimani.

Mi pare che questo gesto trovi una spiegazione nella condotta pastorale di Epifanio in tutto il governo della sua metropoli e delle diocesi suffraganee.

*Nam multi episcopi communionis nostrae et presbyteros in nostra ordinaverunt provincia . . . quos suscepimus cum gratia*¹ può dire a voce alta Epifanio. Egli stesso ha esortato Filone e Teopropo ad ordinare nelle parrocchie limitrofe alla sua diocesi. La pace probabilmente – fa notare Pierre Nautin² – non fu ottenuta senza sforzo; queste precisazioni dovettero essere fatte dopo qualche recriminazione e se il Teopropo menzionato dall'epistola corrisponde a S. Teopropo di Carpasia, successore di Filone, le relazioni di Epifanio con Filone non dovettero essere buone. Ma se il metropolita di Cipro può affermare di avere instaurato un regime di carità e di umana comprensione più che di rapporti giuridici, l'affermazione, anche se in un contesto polemicamente ottimistico, doveva essere fondamentalmente vera.

Altrettanto equilibrio dimostrò Epifanio nel proteggere e far fiorire la vita monacale nella sua provincia ecclesiastica. Mentre altrove cominciava già a sorgere nel riguardo dei monaci un po' di diffidenza da parte dei vescovi, questo non avvenne a Cipro, dove l'incremento alla vita monacale era dato dalla stessa ascetica figura del metropolita. A tutti egli proponeva come modello Ilarione³, ma il gregge avrà preso forma soprattutto dal pastore. L'epistola 108 di Gerolamo⁴ ci attesta che a Cipro durante il suo episcopato ormai «vi erano monaci di tutto il mondo»!

6. *I limiti della formazione teologica di Epifanio*

Si debbono riconoscere pienamente certi limiti di una dottrina talora *languidior*, ma forse approfondendo l'indagine sui fattori

¹ Ger. Ep. 51. CSEL 54/398.

² I. c.

³ Ger., Vita Hilarionis. PL 23/29.

⁴ CSEL 55/312.

di «race» e di «milieu» che hanno contribuito alla sua formazione, anche le ombre avranno la loro spiegazione e la figura apparirà più coerente e razionale.

I genitori furono probabilmente giudeo-cristiani. Che fossero cristiani si deve arguire dal fatto che egli, il quale non rifuggì dal parlare di sé quando ciò potesse avere un qualche rapporto con la fede, non parlò mai di una sua conversione al cristianesimo. Che fossero ebrei mi pare si possa dedurre non tanto dalla biografia romanzata detta di Giovanni e Polibio¹ (che in questo caso però possiamo credere rifletta una tradizione), ma soprattutto dal tono filogiudaico che affiora nei suoi scritti e dalla conoscenza tutta particolare del giudaismo.

A mio avviso bisogna riportare la data della sua nascita attorno al 315. S. Gerolamo infatti nel 393, mentre afferma che Epifanio è ormai *in extrema senectute*, ce lo presenta però ancora in piena attività apostolica: l'età di circa 78 anni potrebbe giustificare entrambe le affermazioni.

Vide la luce a Besanduche, borgata di Eleuteropoli, tra i monti e le balze a Sud-Ovest di Gerusalemme che diedero al suo carattere «del monte e del macigno», e fu educato in un cenobio egiziano della Regola Pacomiana. La prima educazione dovette essere improntata al senso della verità e della rettitudine, all'osservanza integrale del cristianesimo: mai egli avrà a confessarsi come Agostino, di un trionfo del male nella sua anima. La storia e la leggenda² ce lo presentano come l'asceta dalla castità selvaggia.

Agguerrito nella virtù e nel sapere, tornò in patria e vi fondò un nuovo monastero di cui fu il capo naturale; ivi esercitò il suo apostolato dentro e fuori le mura del cenobio combattendo contro lo gnosticismo e l'arianesimo... Nel 366 fu eletto vescovo di Costanza in Cipro, l'antica Salamina, l'odierna Famagosta.

Tutta la sua spiritualità trova però la spiegazione migliore nella scuola che lo educò, che fu di tipo prettamente religioso. Sul testo greco dei Settanta egli dovette imparare a scrivere. Le sue conoscenze del mito e della storia dei Greci sono estremamente povere, ma soprattutto il suo spirito è alieno dalla cultura e dalla filosofia pagana. Credo che si sintetizzi bene la sua figura

¹ PG 41/23–114.

² Cfr. soprattutto l'eresia 26^a GCS 25/297–298 e la vita di Giovanni e Polibio PG 41/23–114.

quando lo si definisce il campione della fede, sprezzatore degli umani sillogismi.

L'educazione monacale non soltanto lasciò un'impronta indelebile nella sua formazione intellettuale, ma soprattutto nel suo carattere e nella sua vita morale. «Il a été éduqué en Egypte par des moines, écrit Sozomène. Cette parole est celle qui le résument le mieux!»¹

La sua figura intellettuale risente d'un ambiente cenobitico di spiriti certamente poco «cultivés et pénétrants»². Quando Alessandro di Licopoli affermava che la causa prima di ogni eresia si doveva trovare nell'antintellettualismo del Vangelo, dava una soluzione antitetica a quella di Epifanio³, ma coglieva nel punto giusto il problema di certa spiritualità della Chiesa primitiva. In Epifanio, così aderente al Cristianesimo delle origini, non si può negare che affiori un ascetismo dualistico, che a prima vista sorprende. Secondo lui p. es⁴, la razza delle donne è instabile, facile ad ingannarsi, di mente piccina; il diavolo quando non può far presa sul sesso maschile, trova una via sicura attraverso il sesso femminile⁵: ma l'inferiorità della donna risponde ad una precisa disposizione divina⁶. In questo tono antifemministico pare faccia eccezione l'esaltazione della Vergine⁷; ma evidentemente Maria non è una donna come tutte le altre!

Egli difende spesso l'istituto divino delle nozze, afferma che la donna non è opera diabolica poiché serve «per la procreazione della prole nella santità»; ma il tono, anche se le parole dicono altro, rivela sempre la sua diffidenza verso la donna; è impossibile, dice nell'articolo LXVI⁸ del Panarion, che nella natura divina si possa concepire un sesso femminile.

Potrebbe talora sembrare che vi sia in Epifanio un ritorno ossessivo agli argomenti sessuali, che egli si esprima qualche volta in termini di troppo crudo realismo; ma non credo affiori mai in questi casi un subcosciente compiaciuto!

Epifanio fu un monaco integrale, anzi d'una coerenza persino eccessiva, che lo portò a comprendere poco la fragilità umana⁹.

¹ Nautin, l. c., col. 626.

² Nautin, l. c.

³ Cfr. C. Manichaeos, cap. 1.

⁴ Haer. 79,1. GCS 37/476.

⁵ Haer. 37,2. GCS 31/52–53.

⁶ Haer. 78,19. GCS 37/469–470.

⁷ Haer. 78,18. GCS 37/specie 468 seg.

⁸ GCS 37/82. Cap. 45.

⁹ Haer. 59 passim. GCS 31/363 segg. specie al cap. 5 GCS 31/369–370.

Aderí p. es. alla dottrina penitenziale della Chiesa e rigettò ogni rigorismo: ma si sente sempre il suo atteggiamento severo¹.

La sua teologia non fu *omnino languidior!* Chi meglio di lui nel campo Trinitario, e Cristologico, nella dottrina sullo Spirito Santo ebbe tanta sicurezza di esposizione? Anche se la sua formazione intellettuale fu aliena dalla speculazione filosofica, dall'intellettualismo Platonico del didascaleion Alessandrino, dal realismo razionalistico della scuola d'Antiochia, dall'indirizzo mediano ma filoorigenista della Cappadocia; la sua intelligenza però non è stata meno aperta alla visione delle grandi «ideemadri» del Cristianesimo, così come deve aderirvi il popolo cristiano, quali sgorgano mitidamente dalle Scritture rivelate e dalla tradizione ecclesiastica, nell'esegesi più facilmente aderente alla dottrina cattolica, nell'aderenza più fedele alle definizioni conciliari.

7. Significato del suo antiellenismo e del suo antignosticismo

In tempi in cui i veri principi del popolo erano i vescovi e la Chiesa dopo tre secoli di elaborazione trovava la soluzione di tanti conflitti nella sintesi armonica del vecchio col nuovo; quando Ambrogio attuava la sintesi dell'umanesimo cristiano nel campo sociale e politico, Gerolamo il filologo innamorato di Cicerone e di Cristo interpretava la parola rivelata e le vicende della storia continuando le gloriose tradizioni del classicismo, Agostino filosofo e teologo raccoglieva gli elementi del sapere e dell'esperienza umana e cristiana per trasmetterli ai posteri; quando Basilio di Cesarea il romano fra i greci codificava i rapporti tra la civiltà classica e la vita cristiana, Gregorio Nazianzeno e Giovanni Crisostomo nutriti parimenti di retorica e di fede dimostravano al mondo che si potevano raggiungere i vertici dell'eloquenza demostenica anche col nuovo contenuto cristiano, Gregorio di Nissa il Cappadoco speculativo che continuava nell'ortodossia le elucubrazioni di Origene raccoglieva ed approfondiva le espressioni migliori del platonismo cristiano; Epifanio si staglia nella sua arcaica figura, col suo volto proteso all'indietro, alieno dalla saggezza e dalla cultura classica, da ogni conciliazione del vecchio col nuovo, forse memore del detto evangelico che il vino nuovo non va messo negli otri vecchi. Ma

¹ V. p. es. Haer. 59. GCS 31/363 seg.

8 Cross, Studia Patristica VIII

questa sua singolare posizione di solitario non denota necessariamente stranezza o mania, può esprimere un'affermazione di personalità e si spiega col tono particolare della sua formazione cenobitica. Il senso storico moderno non ci fa giudicare gli uomini alla stregua di un canone o di uno schema preconcetto!

Per altro la reazione antiellenica di questo *Cato Maior* del primo umanesimo cristiano deve essere valutata superando il giudizio classicistico di Fozio¹, che esalta l'utilità del contenuto e biasima l'umiltà della forma. Invero la sua espressione è disarmonica, confusa, complicata, agli antipodi dei canoni della retorica; egli fu veramente alieno dalla *paideia* ellenica e sprezzatore della forma classica. Ma forse che l'atticismo lessicale dei suoi tempi ben si adattava all'espressione del pensiero teologico? Forse che l'asianesimo retorico non era un abito logoro? Credo che secondo lui la neosofistica educasse all'incanto di una trasmissione simbolica o di una creazione imaginifica ed evocatrice, degna della falsità e teatralità gnostica. A lui, nemico di ogni compromesso, essa dovette sempre sembrare una tecnica vacua, sensoriale ed oziosa, indegna del messaggio semplice, spirituale ed obiettivo del cristianesimo. A me pare che si sia formata in lui, fin dagli inizi della sua educazione nel cenobio, questa costante e coerente *forma mentis* che metteva sullo stesso piano la falsità della sofistica e l'impostura della gnosi. Lo gnostico per lui fu sinonimo di Elleno². Ellenismo significò per lui decadentismo estetico ed etico, edonistico ed irrazionale, la cui spiritualità era bene espressa dallo gnostico serpente *Ouroboros*, divoratore di se stesso. Retorica e gnosi sono messe sullo stesso piano³ là dove il flauto sensuale è detto il tipo del serpente, che a sua volta è figura di Satana. Il flautista infatti, che prima guarda in alto e poi in basso, prima si piega a destra e poi a sinistra, è per Epifanio l'immagine del demonio, che si rivolte contro Dio in una vertigine di potenza e si rivolge alla terra per instaurarvi il dominio dispotico da oriente ad occidente; la sua frode si attua attraverso l'irrazionale del ritmo fascinatore!

Altrove⁴ rimprovera agli Ofiti il fatto che essi venerano il serpente come principio di conoscenza. Ma in questo atteggia-

¹ PG 41/21; Bibl. di Fozio cod. 124.

² Haer. passim, ma cfr. p. es. Haer. 31,1–3. GCS 25/382–387..

³ Haer. 25, 4. GCS 25/272.

⁴ Haer. 37, 3. GCS 31/53 seg.

mento contro l'irrazionale nell'arte e nella conoscenza, credo si possa scorgere in Epifanio un motivo che oserei chiamare classico. Facciamo astrazione da quanto di confuso e complicato frammentario e disorganico ci infastidice nei suoi scritti e che è così alieno dalla semplicità e armonia classica! Mi riferisco a quell'atteggiamento del suo spirito che vede p. es. attuarsi il dramma della salvezza senza ricorrere alla demonologia, senza vedere cioè come p. es. Atanasio, i demoni dovunque ad infestare l'aria e ad impedire la via del cielo; contro i quali sarebbe stata innalzata la croce purificatrice¹. Mi riferisco a quell' opporre costantemente agli ottanta rettili velenosi², ipostasi dionisiache degli errori eretici, il suo mondo apollineo di semplice, dominatrice verità.

Mi pare che tutta la polemica antignostica di Epifanio sia stato in fondo un appello al mondo della vera saggezza umana e cristiana. Nella difesa della libertà contro il fatalismo manicheo, fu sulla linea di Carneade, i cui argomenti ripeté come il *topos* della tradizione umanistica³. Nell'antiesoterismo gnostico fu sulla linea della più elevata filosofia greca e del buon senso latino che proscrivevano ogni pratica delirante ed estatica⁴. Egli fu alieno dal principio sofistico dell'uomo misura delle cose, ma fu aderente alla regola di fede dell'umanesimo cristiano, che vede nell'umile possesso della luce divina il fondamento di ogni metafisica e di ogni gnoseologia. Trionfale fu il suo tono nell'affermare una luminosa verità, umilmente posseduta dalla fede, contro ogni scepse ed ogni decadentistica *Sehnsucht*; come eroica fu la sua visione di una conquista morale nell'ascesi dominatrice di sé.

Epifanio distingue tra Ellenismo, eresia-madre, e le eresie che ne derivano. Egli vede nell' «Elleno» «un'immagine del Cristianesimo»⁵; ma nelle sette ellenistiche non vede che gli errori dei misteri «egiziani e babilonesi» importativi da Orfeo⁶! Pare si rifaccia alla religiosità delle origini, in cui l'apollineo greco poneva sotto inchiesta il dionisiaco barbarico, predicando non i riti magici cui anelava la folla, ma l'ascesi purificatrice del saggio.

Egli fu per l'*aurea mediocritas* e contro l'esasperazione dell'ascetismo; affermava pienamente i valori della materia e della

¹ Cfr. Daniélou, «I demoni dell'aria» in *Studia Anselmiana*.

² Cfr. specialmente Haer. 3,5–9. GCS 31/43 segg.

³ Cfr. Amand l. c.

⁴ Cfr. Rony, *La magie*, p. 44–49.

⁵ Haer. 2,7; GCS 25/174–175; Anakeph. I, 3. GCS 25/164.

⁶ Cfr. Haer. 3–8. GCS 25/176–187.

carne, sia dei cibi già dichiarati impuri sia di quelli già riconosciuti puri¹. La sua concezione del dramma cosmico «cristianesimo – eresia» si rifà certamente all'impostazione classica e paolina di Ireneo²: vede nella storia uno svolgimento della dialettica metafisica tra verità ed errore.

La sua visione antropologica si armonizza con quella cosmologica e metafisica in una sintesi di spirito e di materia, contro ogni dualismo o pluralismo caotico, contro il frammentario decadente. Male e bene sono inseparabili³ come inseparabili sono la giustizia e la bontà divina⁴; alla volontà di Dio non resiste nessuno⁵ ma essa non si oppone al libero arbitrio dell'uomo; diversamente non avrebbe ragione di esistere il giudizio universale⁶.

Nulla fu tanto alieno dalla figura di Epifanio quanto un contrasto romantico o decadente! L'erudito ed il *pentaglotta* venerato da Gerolamo⁷ rifiutò la forma che gli altri Padri avevano pure mutuata dall'ellenismo, ma non credo che con ciò abbia rinnegato la spiritualità classica nei suoi elementi essenziali.

Il saggio metropolita di Cipro seppe affermare la sua personalità nelle relazioni interne ed esterne alla sua diocesi; mentre creava quel clima di indipendenza e di autonomia cipriota che sarà sancita nel Concilio di Efeso, fece ovunque sentire la sua voce autorevole, nelle questioni dommatiche e disciplinari; ma tutto ciò in semplicità di vita e col prestigio della sua virtù, in un clima di libertà cristiana che a me richiama quello della classica democrazia ateniese, lontano da quel dispotismo ellenistico e da quel relativismo decadente che caratterizzò invece il suo alleato, Teofilo di Alessandria. La carica di energia simpatica che portò Epifanio in primo piano nel prestigio dei contemporanei, emanò soprattutto dal fascino della sua erudizione e della sua santità.

Alla cui luce in fondo forse potrebbero finire col dare risalto certe ombre, quali quella mancanza di lucidità di pensiero e quella povertà di espressione, che sono così distanti dallo stile greco;

¹ Haer. 30,22. GCS 25/362 ss.

² Cfr. Haer. 2, 4 ss. GCS 25/174 ss. ed Ireneo, *Adversus haereses*, passim.

³ Haer. 56, 16–17. GCS 37/39 segg.

⁴ Haer. 33, 9–10. GCS 25/459 ss.

⁵ Haer. 80, 7. GCS 37/239.

⁶ Haer. 64, 49–50. GCS 31/477 seg.

⁷ *Apologia adv. libros Rufini* PL 23/462; *liber contra Ioannem Hierosolymitanum* PL 23/362–363.

quel mancato equilibrio diplomatico che lo fece apparire talora strano ed altranzista nel difendere la causa della fede e quel suo dinamismo di gesti poco politici che lo fece apparire talora piuttosto un uomo di parte anzichè un fautore della chiesa universale. Nella figura di Epifanio ancora potranno apparire più le ombre che la luce; ma comunque sarà stato utile l'avere messo in evidenza i nuovi elementi che danno alla ricerca gli studi recenti sull'origenismo del IV secolo e l'aver quindi cercato di ridimensionare alcuni giudizi ormai tradizionali.

The ps.-Dionysius and the Holy Hierotheus

I. P. SHELDON-WILLIAMS, London

I

As is well known, the philosophy of the ps.-Dionysius approximates so closely to that of Proclus that he is widely held to have imitated him, which would mean that the Dionysian corpus could not have been written before the fifth century. On the other hand, the Christianism of the ps.-Dionysius seems to derive immediately from the Cappadocians, and particularly from St. Gregory of Nyssa¹. No Christian writer, writing explicitly as a Christian, has been identified as an intermediary between St. Gregory and the ps.-Dionysius, while we know of a series of writers, such as Porphyry, Iamblichus and Syrianus, who mediate between Plotinus, to whom St. Gregory owes his neoplatonism, and Proclus, whose neoplatonism is of the same brand as that of the ps.-Dionysius. The difficulty of explaining why the Christian sources of the ps.-Dionysius should ante-date the source of his neoplatonism by a century would be removed if it could be shown that the latter was not Proclus but one of these predecessors.

In point of fact, most of the passages where the ps.-Dionysius seems most obviously to be depending on Proclus have been re-examined in recent years, and it has been plausibly shown that these could as well derive from earlier authors who could have been the common source of both writers². But progress along

¹ Lot-Borodine, 'Initiation à une mystique sacramentaire de l'Orient', *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, 24, Nov., 1935, 672; C. Pera, 'Denys le Mystique et la Theomachia', ib., 25, 1936, 5–75; H. Ch. Puech, 'La ténèbre mystique chez le ps.-Denys et dans la tradition patristique', *Études carmélitaines*, 23, 2 Oct. 1938, 33–53; Parente, *Quaestiones de mystica terminologia*, Washington DC 1941, ch. VI; A. J. Festugière, *L'enfant d'Agrigente* Paris 1942, 146; J. Daniélou, *Platonisme et théologie mystique*, ed. 2, Paris 1953, 7, 10, 135; W. Völker, *Kontemplation und Ekstase bei Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita*, Wiesbaden 1958, 140 et passim.

² C. Pera, *S. Thomae Aquinatis in librum Beati Dionysii de divinis nominibus expositio*, Turin-Rome 1950, 157–159, 219; E. Turolla, *Dionigi Areo-*

these lines is impeded by two factors: the writings of Proclus' predecessors survive only in a very incomplete state; and the ps.-Dionysius, anxious to present his doctrine as wholly based on Christian traditions, cites no authorities that are not scriptural, or thought by him to be so.

II

To this there is one exception: a certain Hierotheos, who to a considerable extent is made responsible for the neoplatonic elements of his teaching. Attempts to identify this mysterious figure have been almost as numerous as the attempts to identify the ps.-Dionysius himself. They can be resolved into three possible alternatives: either he is purely fictitious, a mouthpiece for ideas which the author did not wish to announce *propria persona*, but which are in fact his own; or a symbolic figure representing the writers of the late Neoplatonic school which the ps.-Dionysius accepted as an authority equal to that of the Scriptures; or an historical person. The first two alternatives are the less likely. It is difficult to see why the author, already protected by a pseudonym, should proceed to the further mystification of attributing his doctrine to a fictitious master; and this becomes still less probable when we remember that in the fiction of the pseudonym he already has one master in the Apostle Paul; and if he felt the need to invent a second to authorise doctrines which he would find difficulty in ascribing to the first, he would not have made Hierotheos also a disciple of St. Paul, who is described as the sun which illuminates 'both us and our guide' (i. e., Hierotheus)¹. Again, if he wished to shelter behind a fictitious authority he would have done so more thoroughly and especially in his bolder moments. In fact, apart from two direct quotations, I can find only four direct references to the teachings of Hierotheus: one in the *Celestial Hierarchy*, where the distribution of the nine angelic orders is attributed to him²; two in the

pagita; le opere: versione et interpretazione, Padua 1956, 27–28; Völker, op. cit., 88; E. Elorduy, Ammonio Sakkas, 1, Burgos 1959.

¹ ps.-Dionys., DN, 649D2, 865B8–9 (For the ps.-Dionys. references are to columns of Migne, PG 3. The four treatises, *De diuinis nominibus*, *De cœlesti hierarchia*, *De ecclesiastica hierarchia*, *De mystica theologica*, are abbreviated DN, CH, EH, MT, respectively).

² CH, VI 2, 200D–201A13.

Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, where it is on his authority that it is said that the first motion of *Nous* is the love of God, and that the Eucharist is the ‘rite of rites’ (*τελετῶν τελετή*)¹; and one in the *Divine Names*, where Hierotheus explains why the Scriptures sometimes describe God as old, sometimes as young: He is before the first in order of time, and therefore old; and is the closest of all to the beginning of time, and therefore young². These opinions seem harmless enough.

The vividness of the language in which Hierotheus is described seems to preclude the possibility that he is a symbolic or type figure. He is ‘our famous guide’³, ‘our teacher and friend’⁴, and a ‘master of hymnody’ (*ὕμνολόγος*), a title he earns for his enthusiasm in singing the hymn of praise after the celebration of the Eucharist⁵. Finally, he was one whose knowledge of the Divine Mysteries was gleaned from every possible source: from the teachers who went before him; from his own industry in studying the Scriptures; and from initiation into a yet higher form of knowledge in which the Mysteries are not so much actively learnt as passively received (*οὐ μόνον μαθὼν ἀλλὰ καὶ παθὼν τὰ θεῖα*)⁶. Such language could surely be used only of a real person. Furthermore, the ps.-Dionysius, in excusing himself for expounding the doctrines of Hierotheus, reminds ‘Timothy’, to whom the exposition is addressed, that it was Timothy himself who asked him to do so, and sent him the book of Hierotheus for this purpose⁷. This detail *may* have been invented to give verisimilitude, but it rings true. And again, why should the author have taken so much trouble to establish his fiction, if fiction it is?

III

There is some reason, then, for taking Hierotheus to be a real person: but what sort of a person? The ps.-Dionysius, by the titles he gives him, indicates precisely the position Hierotheus occupies in the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy: as *hieromystes*⁸ and *hierotelestes*⁹,

¹ EH, II 592A15; III 424C1–8. ² DN X 2,937.

³ DN II 9, 648A11–12; 11, 649D2; III 2, 681A2; 681C8; VII 1, 865B8–9; CH, VI 2, 201A6–7; EH, II 392A15; III 424C4.

⁴ DN III 2, 681A12–13; B 11; 3, 684B5.

⁵ DN, III 2, 684A3. ⁶ DN, II 9, 648B2–3.

⁷ DN, III 2, 681A1–B10.

⁸ ib., 681A5.

⁹ DN, IV 14, 713A2; X 2, 937B13–14; CH, VI 2, 200D2–3.

he is the interpreter and celebrant of the Mysteries which constitute the highest order of the hierarchy, namely, the Scriptures and the Sacraments. Therefore he himself belongs to the second order, the sacerdotal, in which he performs the functions of bishop and priest. He is then a bishop (for the bishop's functions include those of priest, and not *vice versa*), or, to use the term preferred by the ps.-Dionysius, *hierarch*, the highest member of his order.

So the ps.-Dionysius describes him, and if Hierotheos himself is not a fiction there is no reason to suppose that his function is. For although, apart from the few citations in the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, his actual utterances are rather those of a neoplatonic philosopher than a Christian bishop, and it might be argued that this rôle is allotted to him to support the claim of orthodoxy for the Dionysian Neoplatonism, the ps.-Dionysius would hardly have ventured to do so unless it was conceivable that a man holding such views could be a Christian bishop, and if it was conceivable there is no reason to doubt its truth.

IV

We must now consider the opinions of Hierotheus, a real person and a bishop, as they are presented by the ps.-Dionysius. He makes his most important appearance in the *Divine Names*, the earliest extant Dionysian treatise. He is introduced near the beginning of it¹ with a quotation from his Theological Elements (*θεολογικαὶ στοιχεῖασεις*) which illustrates how that which is in itself inexpressible can be expressed through the effects which it produces. The subject of the passage is the Incarnation, by which the Universal Cause, which transcends every whole and every part, every nature and every essence, by grace (*φιλανθρωπία*) enters into nature and essence as a part of it, yet without relinquishing its transcendence, its supernaturality and its superessentiality. It closely resembles a passage from the *De mysteriis*² which, if not by Iamblichus himself³, certainly belongs to his school: Out of the inexpressible One, the Father

¹ DN, II 9, 648B10.

² De myst., VII 2.

³ Rasche, *De Iamblichii libri qui inscribitur de mysteriis auctore*, Münster, 1911.

reveals Himself as the beginning and God of gods, the Monad from the Henad, the pre-existence of being.

It is through this Mystery that the unnameable First Cause can be given names. Therefore the Hierothean extract supplies a text for the whole treatise, which the author acknowledges to be an elaboration of the *Theological Elements*¹. It explains the series of names applied (presumably without explanation) by Hierotheus to the First Cause. Of these the most important are: the One, the Good², Being, Life, Wisdom³, Power, Peace⁴, Holy of Holies, King of Kings, Lord of Lords, God of Gods⁵.

In spite of the author's emphatic assurance at the beginning of the treatise that he is following the Scriptures, there is nothing peculiarly scriptural in these names, except in the last four. The mysteries into which Hierotheus initiated him are not a revelation of Scripture but of Neoplatonism: a Neoplatonism which is later than Plotinus but could belong to any period from Iamblichus onwards. There are two principles before the intelligible world, for the One is distinguished from, and set above the Good. Strictly speaking, the One lies outside the scope of this treatise. It is not a name but stands for the name of the Unnameable, which cannot even be described as One, and is more appropriately called ὑπερηγνωμένη, transcending unification. The Good, on the other hand, is the first name of God as Cause, for this is His name which most adequately expresses the boundless dispensation of the Divine Providence⁶, and therefore includes the concepts of God both as efficient and as final cause⁷, i. e., the principles of diversification and unification. We know from Damascius⁸ that Iamblichus interposed another One between the absolute One of Plotinus (which he called ἀρρητός, a favourite epithet of the ps.-Dionysius which also occurs in the extract quoted from the *Theological Elements*) and *Nous*: and in the *De mysteriis*⁹ the first transcendent principle is called One ($\vartheta\epsilon\delta\varsigma\; \varepsilon\iota\varsigma$) and the second the Good ($\delta\;\check{\nu}\tau\circ\varsigma\;\dot{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\theta\delta\varsigma$).

¹ DN, III 2, 681B5.

² DN, IV.

³ DN, V-VII.

⁴ DN, VIII, XI.

⁵ DN, XII.

⁶ DN, II 1, 636C1-12; IV 1-4, 693B-700C.

⁷ DN, I 2.

⁸ Damasc., Dub. et sol., 43, I 86 Ruelle.

⁹ De myst., VIII 2.

After the One and the Good the ps.-Dionysius mentions a triad of names, Being, Life, and Wisdom. In the passage he quotes from Hierotheus this triad is Being, Life, *Nous*. That is to say, it is the 'intelligible triad' usually associated with Iamblichus¹, but also found in other later neoplatonists such as Syrianus², Theodore of Asine³, and the anonymous commentary on the *Parmenides* published by W. Kroll⁴ which may well be by Porphyry⁵. In any case, this triad seems to have been a recognised feature of Neoplatonism from his time⁶.

In his exposition, the ps.-Dionysius appears to have conflated *Nous*, the third member of this triad, with *Sophia*, which properly belongs with the two names which follow, Power and Peace. For the triad *Sophia-Dynamis-Eirene* was known at least as early as Constantine, who dedicated his three churches in Byzantium to Hagia Sophia, Hagia Dynamis, and Hagia Eirene⁷. It appears to be a triad of virtues, and to denote the form under which the Deity manifests Himself in the soul, the psychic triad which one would expect after the intelligible. A psychic triad, though not of these terms, formed part of the system of Iamblichus⁸.

V

Finally, the last group of names, which alone is primarily scriptural, denotes God's relation to man on earth, and as such is particularly associated with the body.

In the chapter on the Name of the Good, Hierotheus is again quoted verbatim with three extracts from his *Erotic Hymns*⁹. In the first it is stated that Love ($\xi\varrho\omega\varsigma$) is homogeneous, and is the

¹ Proclus, In Tim., III 45.5 sq. Diehl, Leipzig 1903.

² Syrianus, In metaph., 46.37.

³ ap. Proclus, op. cit., II 247.23; III 64.8.

⁴ W. Kroll, 'Ein neuplatonischer Parmenidescommentar in einem Turiner Palimpsest', Rheinisches Museum, 47, 1892, 618 (fr. XIV 15–16).

⁵ P. Hadot, 'Fragments d'un commentaire de Porphyre sur le Parménide', Revue des études grecques, 74, 1961, 410sq.

⁶ Proclus, op. cit., III 64.8 sq.

⁷ E. von Ivanka, 'Die Trias Sophie-Dynamis-Eirene im neuplatonischen Denken und die Kirchengründungen Konstantinus' des Großen', communication to the Sixth Congress of Byzantine Studies, 1939, 102–104, reprinted in: Plato Christianus. Übernahme und Umgestaltung des Platonismus durch die Väter, Einsiedeln, 1964.

⁸ Proclus, op. cit., II 240.4–6.

⁹ DN, IV 15–17, 713A8–C11.

bond which keeps the hierarchies in their relative positions and binds the orders together in each hierarchy. It is the Divine Love, which manifests itself as intelligible on the intelligible plane, as psychic in the soul, and as physical in the body. In the second extract these divisions are re-united, and this is the means by which all may return to the unity of the Divine Love which is the object of the quest of all. First, the many gradations are reduced to two, heavenly and earthly love; and then (in the third extract), the two unite in the one Love which holds all things together and to the Good, from which it proceeds forth again. Love, therefore, is a cyclic movement from and to the Good which is self-moving and moves through all things and calls all things back to itself.

This is Plotinian doctrine. The Good, to be good, must be self-moving for it must communicate its good to others. God is love not only, as for Aristotle, because He is the object of love, but also because He is the source of love¹. But there is at least one post-Plotinian element: the intelligible love is divided into two, intelligible (*νοητός*) and intelligent (*νοερός*). This distinction is first found in Iamblichus², and corresponds to his division of *Nous* into that which contemplates the One alone, and that which contemplates the genera of being³.

VI

The doctrine which lies at the core of the *Divine Names*, and which is elaborated from the citations from Hierotheus, is that the Divine Goodness which is in itself unknowable makes itself knowable on every level of the nature which it creates: on the intelligible plane as Being, Life, and *Nous*; in the soul as Wisdom, Power and Peace; in the physical world as Holy of Holies, Lord of Lords, King of Kings, God of Gods. The Good is not the name of its ultimate nature, but of the power by which it emerges in these manifestations. The ultimate nature is unnameable, and is called One only because throughout its manifold manifestations it retains its unity (for it is immutable), and can only be envisaged by us as the unity which comprehends and co-ordinates the many, both vertically in the hierarchy of values and horizontally within

¹ DN, IV 14 ad init.

² Proclus, op. cit., I 308.

³ id., op. cit., I 230.5–8.

each order, by the bond of love. Therefore, wherever love is found it is the same love, for everywhere it is the power by which the Divine Goodness descends from the highest to the lowest, and the force by which the lowest is drawn up to the highest. This, according to Hierotheus, is the meaning of the Incarnation.

VII

As the *Divine Names* is an exposition of the *Theological Elements* of Hierotheos, so the other Dionysian treatises expound the doctrine of the *Divine Names*¹. The *Theological Elements*, to judge from the passage which the ps.-Dionysius quotes from it, and from his elaboration of it, deals with the outpouring or *δύναμις* of the Divine Goodness into the hierarchy of nameable natures, and a final chapter touches upon their return to the One or unnameable. The *Celestial* and *Ecclesiastical Hierarchies* are studies of this latter process, the conversion of all the hierarchies in which the Divine Goodness creates itself to the Divine Goodness which is their source, their substance, their operation. The Ecclesiastical Hierarchy is brought back through its 'Mysteries' (the Sacraments and the Scriptures) to the Celestial, and the Celestial through its highest orders which directly contemplate their source to the Thearchy – not that the operation of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy is different from that of the Celestial or that of the Celestial from the divine operation which brings all things back to itself: as Hierotheus says in the *Erotic Hymns*, love, whether divine or angelic or human, is one love. In the *Celestial Hierarchy* the ps.-Dionysius tells us that while the names of the angels are derived from Scripture (*θεολογία*), it is 'our divine hierotelestes' (i. e., Hierotheus) who groups them into three triads². This triad of triads, and each of the triads of which it is composed, are constructed on the same principles as the triads which play such an important part in the system of Proclus: that is to say, their members are related as being, potency and operation, or as permanence, procession and conversion. But this need not suggest that the system is derived from Proclus. The triad, being-potency-operation, goes back at least to Porphyry; while that of permanence-procession-conversion is

¹ J. Vanneste, *Le mystère de Dieu*, Brussels 1959, 16.

² CH, VI 2, 200D1–4.

older still, being an expression of the Plotinian doctrine that the transcendent Good exceeds its own nature and flows over and creates itself in the subordinate orders, which it draws back into itself. Moreover, the Dionysian system displays a consistency and simplicity which are not found in Proclus, but are reminiscent of the less elaborate system of Iamblichus with its three triads of the intelligent gods ($\tauὰς τῶν νοερῶν τρεῖς τριάδες$) that come immediately after the intelligible triads¹ which in the Dionysian system are replaced by the triune Thearchy, as in the *Theological Elements* of Hierotheus the outpouring of the Divine Goodness is replaced by the Incarnation.

In the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* the authority of Hierotheos is invoked for the anagogic interpretation of the Christian rites². The end of the anagogia is the subject of the last of the Dionysian treatises, the *Mystical Theology*. Here there is no reference to Hierotheus, but the matter of the treatise is implicit in the third extract from the *Erotic Hymns*, and the concluding chapter of the *Divine Names* is a foretaste of the theme.

VIII

It has not been my intention to deliver a potted exposition of the teaching of the ps.-Dionysius, but simply to indicate his debt to his acknowledged master, and so throw some light on the teaching of the latter. This would be an empty task if Hierotheus were purely fictitious, and only of minor interest if he were a symbolical figure, but I have tried to show that he was a real person and a Christian. I have also suggested that his philosophy can be derived from Plotinus, Porphyry and Iamblichus, and need not depend on Proclus. If this be so, Hierotheus himself, as well as the ps.-Dionysius, who speaks of himself as his contemporary as well as his disciple, could have lived at a time when the teachings of the Cappadocians were as fresh as the Neoplatonism upon which Hierotheus and the ps.-Dionysius draw. Whereas the Christian Platonism of the Cappadocians looks back to Plotinus, it is rather the immediate successors of Plotinus who influenced Hierotheus and the ps.-Dionysius. This seems a sufficient explanation for the differences between the two schools. The

¹ ap. Proclus, op. cit., I 308 sq.

² EH, III 424C1-8.

elimination of the temporal interval which has seemed to separate these two sets of sources would remove at least one of the many problems which surround the mysterious figure of the founder of Western Mysticism.

Der numidische Manichäismus im vierten Jahrhundert

L. J. VAN DER LOF, Hilversum

Über dasselbe Thema veröffentlichte L. H. Grondijs zwei Aufsätze: *Analyse du manichéisme numidien au IV^e siècle* (in *Augustinus Magister* III Paris 1954, 391–410) und *Numidian Manichaeism in Augustinus' time* (in *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* 1954/55, neunter Jahrgang, Wageningen, 21–42). Seine von großer Sachkenntnis zeugende Erörterung geht dahin, daß er empfieilt, jede manichäische Gruppierung gesondert zu betrachten. Jede manichäische Sekte und jede christliche Ketzerrei war eine Adaptation der ursprünglichen Botschaft an bestimmte regionale Doktrinen. Studiere also jede einzelne Gruppe von Manichäern und kombiniere nicht vorzeitig die Schriften einer Gegend oder einer Periode mit denen der andern¹. Das dünkt uns ein vortrefflicher Rat.

Als Beispiel einer derartigen Einzeluntersuchung jeder manichäischen Sekte gibt Grondijs dann eine Schilderung des numidischen Manichäismus im Afrika des vierten Jahrhunderts². Dazu möchten wir noch einige kritische Randbemerkungen machen, weil diese Schilderung uns nicht sehr gelungen scheint, um dann unsere Auffassung über das Thema zu geben.

Zunächst über die Bedeutung der Tertullianisten, die im vierten Jahrhundert noch immer rege waren. Augustin mußte in seiner eigenen Diözese ihre Gemeinschaften unterwerfen und zerstreuen (*De haeresibus* c. 86). Von ihnen, sagt Grondijs, übernahmen die Manichäer in Afrika die Theorie der progressiven Offenbarung, um sich so dem Christentum anzupassen. Bei den Tertullianisten wurde die Lehre von Christus und Paulus übertroffen und ersetzt durch die von Montanus. Das Evangelium genügte nicht mehr³.

¹ Numidian Manichaeism S. 33.

² S. 37–42.

³ S. 37.

Wir fragen uns, ob der Verfasser hier wirklich einen zwingenden Beweisgrund geliefert hat. Daß im Studierzimmer zwei Gruppen von Menschen auf einen gemeinsamen Nenner gebracht werden, hat uns nicht viel zu sagen. Es hat ebensowenig Wert wie jedes Etikett, das man hinterher auf religiösem Gebiet aufklebt. Daß z. B. verschiedene Religionen alle monotheistisch oder polytheistisch sind, besagt noch nichts über Verwandtschaft. Es handelt sich um die Frage, ob sie denselben Gott oder dieselben Götter anbeten. In bezug auf die progressive Offenbarung ist, auch nicht die Anwesenheit dieses Schemas bei Tertullianisten und Manichäern das Wichtigste, sondern wer denn die endgültige Offenbarung bringt: Montanus oder Mani. Die Anhänger von Montanus und Mani werden sich u. E. schwer auf dieser schematischen Grundlage verwandt haben fühlen können, sondern einander vielmehr als Rivalen betrachtet haben.

Auch unsere zweite Randbemerkung betrifft die Tertullianisten. Grondijs weist darauf hin, daß Tertullian zwischen *Spiritales* und *Psychici* unterschieden hatte, und daß diese Einteilung kaum von der in *Electi* und *Auditores* abweicht¹. Auch hier sollten die Manichäer aus Angst vor Verfolgung zur Annahme eines Stücks Tertullianismus getrieben worden sein. Wiederum will es uns scheinen, daß die Übereinstimmung nicht auf die Notwendigkeit eines Einflusses der Tertullianisten hinweist. Hauptfrage ist nicht das Schema einer Zweiteilung, sondern die Frage, um welche zwei Gruppen von Menschen es sich handelt. Übrigens kannte auch Augustin in der katholischen Kirche die *Spirituales* und die *Turba*. Die *Spirituales* erreichten ihre Stellung durch *vivacitas intelligendi*, und die *Turba* gebrauchte *simplicitas credendi*. Eine Unterscheidung, die für Augustin keineswegs irgendwelche Verachtung der Masse der Gläubigen enthielt². Und gerade Augustin und die Manichäer werden heftig zusammenprallen trotz beider zweiteiligen Schemas, ja, vielmehr dank diesem Schema. Es liegt auch hier gar nicht auf der Hand, daß die Manichäer in der Lehre der Tertullianisten untertauchen, um dadurch Verfolgungen zu entkommen.

Weiter läßt es sich u. E. schwer zusammenreimen, wie der Verfasser an einer andern Stelle seiner Erörterung auf das Allgemeine dieser Zweiteilung hinweisen kann. Er sagt nämlich, daß die

¹ S. 38.

² Six traités anti-manichéens, in Oeuvres de Saint Augustin 17, Paris 1961, S. 781.

9 Cross, Studia Patristica VIII

Manichäer nach dem Vorgang der hellenistischen Mysterien und mehrerer gnostischen Sekten einen allgemein angenommenen Unterschied zwischen *Mystae* und *Advenae*, *gnostici* und *psychici*, *electi* und *auditores* machten¹. Wenn solche Schemata so allgemein waren, weshalb werden dann die Tertullianisten eigens herbeizogen? Wie sich aus den Gesetzen des Theodosius ergibt, kamen die Tertullianisten in seiner Zeit nur in den östlichen Provinzen des Reiches vor. In Afrika fanden sich noch die letzten Überreste dieser Gruppe. Demzufolge muß es psychologisch wenig einladend gewesen sein, in geistlicher Hinsicht bei den Tertullianisten unterzutauchen. Und wer kann uns übrigens garantieren, daß dies nicht geschah bei den Montanisten in Phrygien selbst oder sonstwo im Osten? Und das schon im dritten Jahrhundert? Die Unterscheidung von *Spiritales* und *Psychici* seitens der Montanisten ist aber nicht nur abendländisch (Clem. *Strom.* IV 13,93). An und für sich liegt in ihr noch nicht der förmliche Bruch der Montanisten mit der katholischen Kirche².

Das führt uns zur dritten Randbemerkung. Der Verfasser führt aus, daß die Manichäer den Heiligen Geist in ihr System aufnahmen, obwohl diese Kraft ihrer Theologie durchaus fremd ist und darin eingeführt wurde "pour besoin de la cause". Das Wort Licht war nun in ihrer Terminologie nicht länger brauchbar, aber von den führenden philosophischen Schulen entlehnten sie in Übereinstimmung mit der Lehre von Anaedesimus von Cnossus und verschiedener anderer stoischen Philosophen den Begriff Luft als göttliche Substanz³. Der *besoin de la cause* sollen wieder die Verfolgungen gewesen sein. Aber weshalb, so fragen wir den Verfasser, hat man denn nicht schlankweg ein Stück Katholizismus in die manichäische Lehre übernommen? Das hätte doch einen besseren Schutz geboten als die Stoa!

Weiter möchten wir fragen, wer von den numidischen Manichäern denn so erfahren war in der Philosophie? Faustus war zu Augustins Zeiten ihr berühmtester und gelehrtester Führer. Aber dessen Kenntnisse von der lateinischen Literatur müssen dem Kirchenvater im Vergleich mit seinen eigenen Kenntnissen wohl sehr armselig vorgekommen sein. Von Cicero kannte Faustus nicht einmal die rhetorischen und philosophischen Werke, und

¹ Analyse S. 392.

² Adolf Harnack, Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte I, Tübingen 1909⁴, S. 435.

³ Numidian Manichaeism S. 42.

von Seneca hatte er sehr wenig gelesen. Überdies wußte er nichts von den andern Wissenschaften. Nur die elementare Grammatik hatte er studiert¹.

Die vierte Randbemerkung betrifft Mani als Apostel Jesu Christi. Grondijs nimmt an, daß nur innerhalb der christlichen Oikoumene Mani als Jünger oder Apostel Jesu gefunden wird. Sonstwo, so sagt er, hatten die Manichäer für die Verbreitung ihres Glaubens die Lehre Christi nicht nötig². Der Verfasser will obigem Titel nicht die geringste Bedeutung beilegen. Dem möchten wir gegenüberstellen, daß Augustin sagt: *puto enim neminem esse tam caecum qui velit dicere: Manichaeo credo, cum dicat Christo non credo* (*Contra Faustum XIII 17*). Augustin weiß in-dessen sehr wohl Bescheid über das Erbgut der Manichäer. Deshalb legen wir Wert auf diese Äußerung in *Contra Faustum*.

Augustin kannte z. B. das Werk von Adimas, einem der zwölf unmittelbaren Schüler von Mani³, obwohl dieser zu der Kirchen-vaters Zeiten nicht mehr am Leben war. Gegen ihn richtete Augustin sein *Contra Adimantum Manichaei discipulum*. Aber auch in bezug auf Manis Schriften konnte man dem Kirchen-vater kein X für ein U vormachen. Er kannte sie gründlich und bezweifelte z. B. mißtrauisch die Echtheit von Manis Brief an Menoch. Nun denn, moderne Forschung hält diesen Brief für eine Fälschung⁴.

Die fünfte Randbemerkung betrifft die Trinität. Nach Grondijs adoptierten die Manichäer die Dreieinigkeit, um sich gegen den anti-arianischen Erlaß des Theodosius zu decken. Grondijs faßt diesen Erlaß zusammen: *Cunctos populos . . . in tali religione volumus versari . . . ut secundum disciplinam apostolicam evan-gelicamque doctrinam Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti unam deitatem sub parili majestate, et sub pia trinitate credamus* (Cod. Theod. XVI, 1,2)⁵.

Grondijs hebt hervor, daß Augustin den Manichäern denn auch vorwirft, daß sie in wertloser Weise fortwährend von der Trinität reden. *Haec nomina* (der drei Personen) *non recedebant de ore eorum sed tenus sono et strepitu linguae; et caeterum cor inane veri*

¹ Dr. A. Sizoo, *Toelichting op Augustinus' Belijdenissen*, Delft, S. 108.

² Numidian Manichaeism S. 29.

³ Six traités S. 203.

⁴ G. J. D. Aalders, L'épitre à Menoch, attribuée à Mani, in Vigiliae Christianae Dec. 1960, 245.

⁵ Numidian Manichaeism S. 23.

(*Conf. III, 6*)¹. Inzwischen hätte Grondijs verspüren können, wie Augustin auch nach seiner Bekehrung dennoch unter dem Einfluß der manichäischen Trinität blieb. In einem andern Zusammenhang sagt der Verfasser nämlich, daß der Kirchenvater von der verschiedenen Exegesen des ersten Kapitels des 1. Buches Mosis den Gedanken bevorzugte, daß Gottes Worte „es werde Licht“ sich auf das unzugängliche und unsichtbare, die höchsten Regionen des Kosmos erhellende und doch dem menschlichen Auge unsichtbaren Licht bezogen. Auch hielt es Augustin für möglich, daß das Licht der zwei großen am vierten Schöpfungstag entstehenden Lichter einfach Gottes zentralem, unsichtbarem Licht entsprossen wären (*Contra Faustum XXII, 10*)². Daraus hätte man schon schließen können, wie auch die Christen der katholischen Kirche hinsichtlich der Lehre der Trinität noch im Ungewissen waren.

Wir glauben nicht, daß der anti-arianische Erlaß die Manichäer veranlaßte, eine Dreieinigkeitslehre unter ihre Doktrinen aufzunehmen. Grondijs hat sich u. E. allzusehr durch die Anfangsworte des Erlasses beeindrucken lassen: *Impp. Gratianus, Valentinianus et Theodosius AAA. ad populum urbis Constantinop.* Sowohl in Afrika wie in Italien und Illyrien regierte Valentinianus II. Nicht nur er, sondern auch seine Vormünderin und Mutter Justina begünstigten den Arianismus³. Der heidnische Symmachus und Praetextatus wurden mit Ehren überhäuft. Im Jahre 384 versuchten sie den Altar der Victoria von neuem zu errichten. Augustin wohnte in den Jahren 383 und 384 in Rom im Hause eines Auditors der Manichäer⁴. Doch war der Erlaß schon 380 zur öffentlichen Kenntnis gebracht. Und wenn der Kirchenvater 384 nach Mailand zieht, so geschieht das zum Teil dadurch, daß er von nichtkatholischen Seiten auf verschiedene Weisen protegiert wurde. Vermutlich hatten manichäische Freunde ihn dem Heiden Symmachus vorgestellt⁵. So waren die Verhältnisse unter Valentinianus II., in dessen Reich von kirchlicher Seite sogar damit gedroht wurde, sich von der Kirche im Reiche des Theodosius loszumachen⁶. Diese Drohung datiert aus dem Jahre

¹ Analyse S. 397.

² Numidian Manichaeism S. 39.

³ A. Piganiol, *Histoire de Rome*, Paris 1954, S. 491.

⁴ Dr. A. Sizoo, *Toelichting* S. 112.

⁵ S. 117.

⁶ Ad. Harnack, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte* II, Tübingen 1909⁴, S. 279.

381, das ist also ein Jahr nach dem anti-arianischen Erlaß. Der Name Valentinianus II. imponiert uns bei diesem Erlaß bestimmt nicht. Es ist unmöglich, daß Valentinianus im Ernst mit dem Erlaß einverstanden gewesen ist, und die Manichäer brauchten ihn also nicht zu fürchten.

Aber hatten sie nun Theodosius selbst zu fürchten? Das war nach unserer Meinung ebensowenig der Fall. Im Jahre 381 berief Theodosius eine große orientalische Synode nach Konstantinopel. Diese Synode bezeichnet einen Umschwung in der Politik des Theodosius¹. Er hat sich, sobald er sich in den orientalischen Verhältnissen orientiert hatte, auf die Seite der dortigen Orthodoxen gestellt. Er wollte den Arianismus nicht durch den Occident und den mit Rom verbundenen alexandrinischen Bischof (Petrus, der sich bereits wie der Ober-Patriarch der griechischen Kirche benahm), sondern durch die orthodoxen Kräfte des Orients selbst bezwingen. Beweis dafür ist, sagt Harnack: 1. Daß er die arianischen Kirchen in Antiochien sämtlich dem Meletius übergeben ließ und Paulinus bei Seite geschoben wurde. 2. Daß er im Edikt (*Cod. Theodos.* XVI 1,3) den Damasus nicht mehr erwähnt, sondern die Orthodoxen des Orients als Autoritäten aufzählt (30. Juli 381). 3. Daß er das häufig und dringend an ihn gerichtete Ansinnen der Abendländer, die antiochenische Streitfrage mit schuldiger Rücksicht auf das Vorrecht des Paulinus zu begleichen, ebenso abgelehnt hat wie ihren Wunsch der Berufung einer ökumenischen Synode nach Alexandrien. 4. Daß er ein orientalisches Concil nach Konstantinopel berufen, sich um das Abendland, Rom und Alexandrien dabei gar nicht gekümmert, den Meletius zum Präsidenten eingesetzt, ihn mit Ehren überhäuft und nach dessen Tode die Wahl eines Nachfolgers gestattet hat. Nach der Art, wie die Synode zusammenberufen war, kann man auch nicht zweifeln, daß er ursprünglich auf eine Eintrachtsformel mit den Macedonianern abgesehen war². Bis soweit Harnack.

Der oben erwähnte Meletius akzeptierte das Wort *δυοούσιος*, aber reduzierte die göttliche Einheit eigentlich zur Gleichheit. Paulinus war sein Gegner in Antiochien, der mit dieser Reduktion nicht einverstanden war, aber von Theodosius zugunsten von Meletius zur Seite geschoben wurde. Macedonius war ein emi-Arianer. Kurz gesagt, Theodosius wählte 381 einen ge-

¹ S. 273.

² S. 273.

mäßigten Kurs. Lieber als sie auszustoßen, wollte er die Arianer zum Semi-Arianismus bewegen.

Die in Konstantinopel Anwesenden haben durch ihre Gesamthaltung, durch die Wahl Flavians zum Nachfolger des Meletius, der während der Synode gestorben war, durch den 3. Kanon (über die Bedeutung des Sitzes von Konstantinopel) und durch die Abweisung des für den konstantinopolitanischen Stuhl von Alexandrien vorgeschlagenen und von Rom patronisierten Maximus Alexandri und dem Abendland, speziell der Politik des Petrus und Damasus, die empfindlichste Niederlage bereitet¹. Wohlgemerkt: Petrus und Damasus, nach deren Lehre man sich seit dem Erlass von 380 zu richten hatte!

Und in der Periode 388–391, in welcher Theodosius fast ununterbrochen in Mailand wohnt, bevorzugt er deutlich die Heiden Nicomachus Flavianus und Symmachus, die hohe Ämter empfangen. Im Osten zeigt er 388 Vorliebe für den heidnischen Tatianus². Auch das ist eine Episode aus dem Leben des Theodosius nach dem Jahre 380. Wir können also in dem Erlass dieses Jahres, auch was Theodosius betrifft, keinen Grund finden, der die Manichäer veranlaßt hätte, die Lehre der Dreieinigkeit in ihre Anschauungen aufzunehmen. Warum sollen nun auf einmal die Manichäer von Furcht befallen worden sein? Der Erlass des Diokletianus von 297 und das Gesetz des Valentinianus I. von 372³, welche sich direkt gegen die Manichäer kehren, machen auch einen furchterregenden Eindruck.

E.-H. Kaden ist davon überzeugt, daß auch wohl andere Edikte von Theodosius I. die Absicht hatten, den Manichäern Furcht einzuflößen. „Wir wissen, daß Theodosius I., auf ihrer praktischen Durchführung nicht bestand, weil er (die Manichäer) nicht strafen, sondern nur in Furcht versetzen wollte, um sie zum Glaubenswechsel zu bewegen.“⁴ „Diese komminatorische Natur unserer Edikte wird zunächst dadurch bestätigt, daß die Manichäer, die zum orthodoxen Christentum übertraten, straffrei blieben, und sie erhellt ebenso auch daraus, daß ihre Strafbestimmungen nur zögernd angewendet worden sind, wenn sie nicht überhaupt ignoriert wurden.“⁵

¹ S. 274.

² Piganiol S. 492.

³ Alfred Adam, Texte zum Manichäismus, Berlin 1954, S. 82–84.

⁴ Erich-Hans Kaden, Die Edikte gegen die Manichäer von Diokletian bis Justinian, in Festschrift Hans Lewald, Basel 1953, S. 67.

⁵ S. 67.

Hiermit beenden wir diese fünfte Randbemerkung, welche uns zeigt, daß Theodosius mit seinem anti-arianischen Dekret nicht die Absicht hatte, tatsächlich gegen die Manichäer energisch vorzugehen. Mit andern Dekreten bedrohte er sie direkt, um sie zum Übertritt zu den Katholiken zu veranlassen. Auch hier stellt es sich heraus, daß der Verlauf der Dinge ein anderer war als Grondijs uns beschrieb. Es ist sehr wohl möglich, daß Schaeders Meinung, daß die manichäische Dreieinigkeit von Mani selbst stammt, richtig ist¹. Augustin mit seiner Kenntnis vom Erbgut der Manichäer wirft ihnen auch nicht vor, daß sie aus Angst die Dreieinigkeit von den Katholiken zu adoptieren versuchten. In seinem Streit mit Felix läßt der Kirchenvater Christus als *dextera luminis* ruhig passieren ohne Protest². Und in der *Epistula Fundamenti* schimmert schon ein unbestimmter Hinweis auf die *dextera luminis* durch (XI, 13).

Nach allem, was wir in unsren fünf Randbemerkungen angeführt und erwogen haben, kommen wir zu dem Schluß, daß Grondijs eine typische numidische Entwicklung der manichäischen Lehre nicht nachweisen kann und daß sein zweiter Versuch, nämlich eine Entwicklung unter christlichen Druck festzustellen, ebenfalls mißlang. Wir haben den bestimmten Eindruck, daß Mani selbst viel stärker vom Christentum inspiriert war und sich wirklich als Jünger Christi betrachtete. Hieraus folgt, daß wir die Manichäer, mit denen es Augustin zu tun hatte, ganz entschieden vom Anfang an für eine christliche Sekte halten. Und so kommen wir zur Darstellung unseres Blickes auf den Gegenstand.

Wir glauben mit Menasce, daß die Manichäer ihre Lehre mit Stolz für das reine Christentum hielten, ohne jüdische Beimischung wie im Christentum der Katholiken. Faustus behandelt auf Grund dieses Bewußtseins die Katholiken als semi-Christen, wie aus *Contra Faustum* hervorgeht. *Non ante effecti Judaei ut merito Hebraicorum Prophetarum sequeremur fidem euntes ad Christianismum, sed sola exciti fama et virtutum opinione atque sapientia liberatoris nostri Christi Jesu* (XIII, 1). *Quare Moysen non accipistis? Amoris pietatisque causa qua colimus Christum* (XIV, 1). Und die stolze Apologie von Faustus (V, 1–13) sagt u. a.

¹ H. H. Schaeder, Urform und Fortbildung des manichäischen Systems, Leipzig 1927, S. 154.

² *Contra Felicem* I, 16.

evangelisch: *Ego patrem dimisi, et matrem, uxorem, filios et caetera quae Evangelium jubet, et interrogas utrum accipiam Evangelium?*¹

Von der eigenen Gruppe sagt Faustus: *Ecclesia nostra sponsa Christi* (XV, 1). Und Fortunatus sagt dazu: *Haec ego et proposui quae sunt credibilitatis nostrae, et quae a te possunt in ista professione nostra firmari, ita tamen ut non desit auctoritas fidei Christianae. Et quia nullo genere recte me credere ostendere possum, nisi eandem fidem Scripturarum auctoritate firmaverim: id ergo est quod insinuavi, quod dixi* (*Contra Fort.* 20)². Faustus akzeptiert vollständig die Eucharistie, weil die Manichäer in bezug auf diesen Punkt denselben Glauben haben wie die Katholiken (*Contra Faust.* XX, 2).

Die Donatisten werteten diese Einstellung der Manichäer noch politisch aus. Sie verkündigten, daß die katholische Geistlichkeit in Numidien mit den Manichäern in engerer Beziehung stand, als sie wahrhaben wollte. In der zwölfjährigen Kontroverse zwischen Augustin und Petilianus von Konstantine wurden Augustin und sein Anhang fortwährend des Manichäismus beschuldigt, und diese Beschuldigung erhoben die Donatisten überhaupt gegen die Katholiken. Der Streit mit Petilianus begann Ende 400³. Frend weist darauf hin, daß sich für diese manichäische Verlockung in der Geschichte der Donatisten keine Parallelen finden läßt. Sie waren in dieser Hinsicht weniger empfänglich als die Katholiken⁴.

Sowohl Papst Gregorius I. (*Ep.* II, 37) als Gregorius II. (*Ep.* 4) warnten dagegen, in Italien ohne vorhergehende Untersuchung afrikanische Priester einzusetzen. Vielleicht wären sie ja Manichäer⁵.

Und Grondijs weist selbst darauf hin, daß Augustin einen Subdiakon nach Mailand zurückschicken mußte, weil es sich herausstellte, daß er *auditor* war und wie die *electi* Sonne und Mond anbetete⁶, und daß Papst Anastasius (399–401) und seine

¹ Pierre Jean de Menasce O. P., *Augustin Manichéen*, in Freundesgabe für Ernst Robert Curtius, Bern 1956, S. 86.

² S. 91.

³ William Frend, *Manichaeism in the struggle between Saint Augustine and Petilian of Constantine*, in *Augustinus Magister II*, Paris 1954, 861.

⁴ S. 864.

⁵ S. 865.

⁶ Analyse S. 392. Ep. 236,2 ad Deuterium: *auditores . . . solem et lunam cum iis (electis) adorant et orant.*

Nachfolger zur äußersten Vorsicht mahnen mußten in bezug auf Afrikaner, welche die Priesterweihe begehrten¹. Grondijs glaubt, daß die Manichäer sich zum christlichen Priester weihen ließen, um in christlichen Kreisen leichter Adepts gewinnen zu können.² Aber wenn es sich nun eben nicht um christliche, doch nur um katholische Kreise handelte? Und alles deutet doch eigentlich darauf hin.

Augustin redet ja von den Manichäern als von Menschen, die Christen genannt werden wollen³. Er sieht in ihnen eine secta⁴ und Häretiker⁵, also ganz bestimmt Christen. Er bekämpft sie deshalb mit den Waffen der Philosophie und der Exegese. Jawohl, auch mit denen der Exegese! Das sieht u. E. Grondijs zu wenig. Um so mehr betont er, daß die Manichäer ihre Anschauungen ausschließlich auf wissenschaftliche Auseinandersetzungen gründeten⁶. Augustins Schriften aber werfen ein Licht auch auf die andere Seite des Problems. Man beachte z. B., daß Faustus auf die astrologischen Fragen des Kirchenvaters nicht tief eingehen wollte, weil er das für unnütze Spekulationen hielt. Er vertrat einen Frömmigkeitstypus, der Augustin imponierte⁷, allein nicht nur ihm. Die Glaubensgenossen des Faustus schätzten ihn sehr hoch. In Rom gewann er viele Anhänger⁸. Und als er später durch Katholiken sich vor dem Gericht des Prokonsuls zu verantworten hatte, da waren es gleichfalls Katholiken, die sich ins Mittel legten, und er wurde nur für kurze Zeit verbannt⁹.

Alles zusammenfassend: die Manichäer waren in Numidien im vierten Jahrhundert eine christliche Sekte. Es zeigt sich, daß sie ihren Trinitätsglauben nicht hinterher einzufügen brauchten, denn ihre Überlieferung war ihnen schon auf diesem Wege vorangegangen. Für besonderen Einfluß der Tertullianisten gibt es keinen Beweis, und ein solcher Einfluß ist als unwahrscheinlich zu betrachten.

¹ S. 392.

² S. 392.

³ *Contra Epist. Fundam. VIII.*

⁴ *Contra Adimantum XI; XIII, 1; XVI, 3; De agone Christiano IV 4; De moribus eccl. cath. et Manich. II, IX, 14; II, XI, 23; II, XII, 26; II, XX, 75.*

⁵ *Contra Epist. Fundam. I; XXXII; De moribus eccl. cath. et Manich. I, IX, 15; II, VIII, 11; II, XX, 75; De agone Christiano IV 4.*

⁶ Analyse S. 402.

⁷ Menasco art. cit. S. 81, 82.

⁸ Sizoo, Toelichtung S. 104.

⁹ S. 104.

Und wer bestätigt, daß auch sonstwo die Manichäer schon zur Zeit des Kirchenvaters eine Art christliche Sekte waren? Theodosius! Denn er betrachtete die Manichäer als Häretiker und unterstellte sie demgemäß auch der allgemeinen Gesetzgebung gegen die Häretiker¹.

Wir verstehen also die folgenden Gedanken ausgesprochen in der ungedruckten Dissertation von Eugen Rose². Mani hat sich beständig, wie uns schon aus Augustins Zeugnis bekannt war, als „Apostel Jesu Christi“ bezeichnet. Diese augustinischen Nachrichten werden durch die zentralasiatischen und ägyptischen Quellen weiter bestätigt. In den Turfan-Texten haben sich Reste von Manis „Evangelium“ gefunden mit der Formel „Mani Apostel Jesu“. Ähnliches enthält ein Brief in der Sammlung koptischer Quellen. Diese Selbstbenennung als Jesu Apostel hinderte ihn freilich nicht, an dem Jesus, wie ihn die neutestamentlichen Evangelien verkündigen, freimütig Kritik zu üben. Dagegen haben Manis Jünger ihren Meister als einen neuen Christus nicht nur dargestellt, sondern auch verkündigt. Das beweisen eine Reihe von bewußt aufgestellten Parallelen zwischen Jesus und Mani. Die mittelasiatischen und koptischen Quellen bestätigen zudem die augustinische Überlieferung, daß die manichäische Gemeinde die beiden Passionsgeschichten zusammengestellt hat, um Manis Überlegenheit zu erweisen. Vollends zeigt das Manis Selbstbezeichnung als Paraklet³.

Aus den Quellen geht mit Sicherheit hervor, daß Mani seine Gemeinde als die rechte Kirche Christi ansah, und die bedeutsamen Ausführungen des Faustus lassen keinen Zweifel darüber aufkommen, daß allein in der Elektenschaft der Manichäergemeinden die Gebote der Bergpredigt gehalten werden⁴.

Dem manichäischen Jesusverständnis liegt der gnostische *Salvator salvandus* zugrunde, dessen doppeltem Wesen die beiden grundverschiedenen Funktionen des manichäischen Jesus entsprechen. Einerseits ist Jesus als Jesus Ziwāna, als Lichtgesandter und als verkörperter Nous der Erlöser der Seelen. Andererseits

¹ Kaden art. cit. S. 59.

² E. Rose, Die Christologie des Manichäismus nach den Quellen dargestellt, Diss. Marburg 1941. Überblick bei Siegfried Schulz, Die Bedeutung neuer Gnosisfunde für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, in Theologische Rundschau. Neue Folge, 26, Tübingen 1960, 230–237.

³ S. Schulz art. cit. S. 231.

⁴ S. 232.

ist er als *Jesus patibilis*, als Jesus das Kind, als das Lichtkreuz und wie die anderen Variationen alle heißen mögen, selber das Erlösungsobjekt, das in einem leidenden Zustand verharrt, wobei die „Kind“-Hypostase die Ansprechbarkeit desselben, woran die Erlösung anknüpft, bezeichnen soll¹. Und Rose kommt auf Grund seiner Jesusanalyse zu dem Ergebnis, daß die These vom christlichen Ursprung des Manichäismus gegenüber dem rein orientalischen (nichtchristlichen) Charakter dieser Religion der Vorzug zu geben sei². Das meinen auch wir.

¹ S. 236.

² S. 237.

Zeno of Verona, Apuleius and Africa

F. E. VOKES, Dublin

It is generally accepted that Andreas Bigelmair was correct in his identification of the author of the sermons ascribed to Zeno of Verona with the Zeno to whom Ambrose referred, and that Zeno was bishop of that city from 362 until 371/2 A. D.¹ Zeno was certainly a theologian of the second rank, but he deserves more attention than he normally receives. His interest for me lies in the curiously uneven level of development in the various aspects of his thought and practice, so that he seems just the ordinary churchman of his time. His sermons need to be taken as a whole rather than as a source of interesting snippets. The Church in Verona needed only a small building, but it was growing quickly². Christians have still to be warned against marriage with pagans.³ There is still private reservation of the Eucharistic elements⁴. Zeno insists on the equality of the first and second persons of the Trinity⁵, but he still uses language of the Apologists of the second century which implies a twofold generation of the Logos⁶. His language about the person of Christ seems now Nestorian, now Monophysite⁷. He has a formula about the Virgin Mary which is almost that of fully developed Catholicism⁸.

Bigelmair argues that Zeno must have connections with Greece and have come from Africa. *Vetus Latina* follows this by adding to his name in the list of authorities for the Old Latin

¹ For the text of Zeno, see Migne, Patrologia Latina, vol. 11. Andreas Bigelmair, Zeno von Verona, Habilitationsschrift, Münster in Westphalia, 1904, and in the Bibliothek der Kirchenväter, Munich, 1934. Ambrose, Letter V to Syagrius PL 16, 891.

² Tractate I 14,2.

³ I 5,7 and 9.

⁴ I 5,8.

⁵ II 1.

⁶ II 3.

⁷ II 8,2 and II 6,1.

⁸ *Maria virgo incorrupta concepit, post conceptum virgo peperit, post partum virgo permanxit*, II 8,2.

text "aus Afrika stammend"¹. The arguments of Bigelmair are that Zeno uses the African text of the Old Latin Bible, of which Cyprian is the chief authority; that Zeno's Latin style is that of Africa and has points of contact with that of Apuleius; and finally that Zeno in one sermon commemorates a little known African martyr, Arcadius of Caesarea in Mauretania.

It is suggested that none of these arguments is decisive for the assumption that Zeno came from Africa.

Of the relationship between the African and European families of the Old Latin text of the Bible F. F. Bruce writes: "The forms in which the Latin Bible appears in Europe are not altogether independent of the earlier African forms, and appear to represent progressive revisions of these"². In the first fascicule of *Vetus Latina* on the *Epistle to the Ephesians* the author says of the African family (K): "Der Typ ist jedoch keineswegs auf Afrika beschränkt. Typischen Lesarten begegnet man in Gallien bei Hilarius, in Irland im Book of Armagh, in Spanien bei Pacian, in Italien bei Ambrosiaster und Paulinus von Nola, der den südgallisch-spanischen Text seiner Heimat zitiert". Elsewhere he says: "Die Verbreitung des K-Typus über das gesamte lateinische Sprachgebiet, die in anderen biblischen Büchern . . . noch deutlicher und noch am Ende des 4. Jh recht massiv in Erscheinung tritt, läßt sich mit historisch gesicherten Beziehungen zu Afrika nicht hinreichend erklären"³. In another part of *Vetus Latina* Dr. Walter Thiele writes: "Über Heimat und Verbreitung der Texte können aber die genannten Bezeichnungen nur sehr bedingt Auskunft geben"⁴. In these circumstances it is not wise to assume that the nature of his Bible text proves that Zeno was an African, especially as Hilary was a contemporary.

Of the style of the fourth century writer Ammianus Marcellinus T. R. Glover wrote some years ago that it reminds us somehow of Apuleius, though it is less successful⁵. In his book *Die Antike Kunstsprache* E. Norden said of the African Latin style: „. . . daß der bombastische und zugleich gezierte Stil der Afrikaner nichts ist als der griechische Asianismus (Manierismus) in latei-

¹ Vol. I, Verzeichnis der Sigel, Freiburg, 1948, p. 104.

² The Books and the Parchments, London, 1963, p. 203.

³ H. J. Frede, *Vetus Latina*, 24 I, 1962, p. 31*.

⁴ Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel, Wortschatzuntersuchungen zu den lateinischen Texten der Johannesbriefe, 1958, p. 11.

⁵ Life and Letters in the Fourth Century, Cambridge, 1901, p. 33.

nischem Gewande. Zwischen dem von mir früher aus Nachahmung griechischer Muster erkläarten Stil der extremen Mode rhetoren, des Valerius Maximus, des Plinius (panegyr.) einerseits und dem des Florus, Appuleius und Tertullian anderseits besteht höchstens ein gradueller oder quantitativer, kein prinzipieller oder qualitativer Unterschied”¹. It is significant that the name Zeno is Greek, that Apuleius was educated in Greece, that both Ammianus Marcellinus and Claudian, the two leading Latin writers of the fourth century, were Greek. There seems then again no certainty that Zeno was from Africa if one judges from his Latin style.

There is an intriguing possible connection between Zeno’s Tractate I 4, 3 and Apuleius, Metamorphoses II 17. Zeno is preaching about the power of lust and says: *Ipsa Venerem membris omnibus denudatam convexis (v. l. connexis) manibus setegere conantem, imo animi sui vitium et corporis demonstrantem, post multa adulteria spectaculo totius mundi quoque prostituit.* The passage in Apuleius describes the scene between Photis and Lucius as follows: *Nec mora, cum omnibus illis cibariis vasculis raptim remotis, laciniis cunctis suis renudata, crinibus quam dissolutis ad hilarem lasciviam in speciem Veneris quae marinos fluctus subit pulchre reformata, paulisper etiam glabellum feminal rosea palmula potius obumbrans de industria quam tegens verecundia, Proeliare, inquit . . .*

It is clear that both writers are referring to the common representation of the nude Venus in statues. Apuleius more clearly is referring to the statue of Venus Anadyomene. There does not however seem any absolute necessity to assume that Zeno knew the passage in Apuleius. If the wording is close, it could arise from a knowledge of the conventional statues by Zeno. F. Lot remarks that there were statues of Venus to decorate nearly all public baths². The poses of late Roman statues were also very conventional. T. J. Haaroff points out that Ausonius wrote a poem on statues and that Sidonius knew the stock attitudes given to philosophers by sculptors³.

Zeno’s lesson from the statues is moreover quite justified. H. B. Walters, in *The Art of the Romans*, writes: “Or, to take another instance, Praxiteles’ conception of the Cnidian Aphrodite,

¹ 3 ed., Leipzig, 1915, p. 596 f.

² *The End of the Ancient World*, London, 1936, p. 148.

³ *The Schools of Gaul*, Johannesburg, 1958, pp. 231 f.

entirely devoid of self-consciousness, led to a whole crowd of imitations, such as the Venus dei Medici in Florence or the Venus of Arles, in which the motive is altogether degraded. They are copies in so far as they reproduce the pose and action of the original; but in their false prudery and sensuality they are but reminiscences of the type”¹. In a similar way it is said in Pauly-Wissowa’s Real-Encyclopaedie: “Beabsichtigt scheint eine Anadyomene, welche mit den Händen Brust und Schoß vor profanen Blicken bedeckt. Die momentane Geschlossenheit und großartige Unbefangenheit der Knidierin geht bei dieser Änderung verloren, die Göttin scheint vorwärts zu schreiten und sich dabei nicht ohne Bewußtheit umzusehen”².

It seems possible therefore that here there is no need to postulate that Zeno knew the passage in Apuleius. He can be drawing his lesson from the contemporary representations of Venus. The sermon on Arcadius in II 18 seems more likely however to show that Zeno himself came from Africa. There is a note in the MSS which reads: *De natali S. Arcadii, qui habet natale prid. Id. Jan. in civitate Caesarea in Mauretania*. Even if Zeno speaks of Arcadius because of his own coming from Africa, it is still noteworthy that an African martyr is being commemorated in Verona in northern Italy. In *The Shape of the Liturgy* Gregory Dix points out that in the Roman calendar of 354 A. D. Perpetua and Felicitas are the only non-Roman martyrs to appear and that there is no place named for the celebration³. Augustine, in Sermon 303, speaks about the Roman martyr Laurence and complains that so few are present to honour him in Hippo. Shortly after Zeno’s death we learn from John Chrysostom of the introduction of the western feast of Christmas into Antioch⁴. We thus have the beginnings of the interchange of calendars between the various parts of the Church and of the commemoration of martyrs apart from their burial places. Though to us Arcadius is an obscure martyr, and we therefore presume that Zeno must have had some very special reason to commemorate him, it is not impossible that there were other reasons why he was known in Verona. It is not

¹ 2 ed., London, 1928, p. 47.

² Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft, Stuttgart, 1894, vol. I, 2786, s. v. Aphrodite.

³ London, 1945, p. 379.

⁴ Sermons on St. Philogonion and on Christmas, 386 A. D., PG 48, 747 and 49, 351.

therefore a compelling proof that Zeno came from Africa. Though the parallel is not exact, for Laurence had the influence of Rome behind him, Augustine is not proved to be Roman by his Sermon 303.

It is suggested that Zeno's knowledge of Tertullian is proof that he came from Africa. Thus Tixeront says: "Zeno too had read Tertullian, but at times he failed to correct the views of his master", and "Phoebadius and Zeno seem to have read Tertullian and to have retained something of that writer"¹. It is not however necessary to presume that Zeno was African because of his use of Tertullian. The "too" in my first quotation from Tixeront and the addition of Phoebadius in the second are proof enough of this. Phoebadius based his *Liber contra Arianos* on Tertullian.

Our knowledge of Zeno, apart from the one reference to him in Ambrose's letter, is all derived from later sources or by deduction from the Tractates. Neither Jerome nor Gennadius mentions him. The deduction that he was African seems to me not to be proved, but his interest as the representative of the ordinary devout pastor of a Latin church in the third quarter of the fourth century remains.

¹ History of Dogmas, Engl. trans., St. Louis, 1914, vol. II, pp. 262, 259.

The Importance of Isis for the Fathers

R. E. WITT, London

The importance of Isis in the Greco-Roman world has been fully vindicated during the past hundred years by such scholars as Drexler, Erman and Rusch, Cumont, Lafaye and Roussel, Al földi and Nilsson, and Brady, Dill, Frazer and Nock. Pagan sources are abundant – literary, epigraphical, papyrological, sculptural and numismatic. There can be no doubt that the worship of the Egyptian deities Isis, Sarapis and Horus¹ flourished far and wide in the Imperial Age before Christianity was adopted as the State's official religion and that the quintessence of the faith which Egypt gave the Roman Empire was the cult of Isis². *Prima facie* the goddess's claim to reign universally – *ἡ τύραννος πάσης χώρας*³ – suggests that the world religion which succeeded hers and made a similar claim encountered no greater rival than this. The danger caused to Christianity by the Egyptian deities with Isis as their head could only be averted by the closing of their temples in 384 on the orders of the Emperor Theodosius: but for another half century (despite the destruction of the Sarapeum at Alexandria by the triumphant Christians

¹ Cf. Legge, *Forerunners and Rivals*, I, 88: "A very old theological conception in Egypt." A Trinitarian view is there quoted: *Thus from one god I became three gods.*

² The Second Century of the Christian Era *est isiaque par excellence* (Leclant, Bull. Fac. Lett. Strasb. March 1959, 306). Cf. also Wilcken UPZ I, 29: In the 2nd. cent. there was an ever stronger "Hervortreten der Isis vor Sarapis." Sterling Dow (Harv. Theol. Rev. 1937, 231) points out that in Athens Isis during the Roman Empire out-distanced "not merely her partner, but all other 'foreign' gods as well."

³ See Dieter Müller in Leipz. Sächs. Akad. Abh. ph. hist. Kl. 1961, 19. Cf. Dill, Rom. Soc. Nero Marc. Aur. 568, 572. The name that is adored throughout the world (*Numen gentibus Isin*, Lucan 9, 158, and *Numen unicum multiformi specie . . . totus veneratur orbis* Apul. Metam. 269,17 ed. Helm) is summed up in the formula "all in all" (Cf. Reitzenstein, Hell. Myst. 27) which resembles I Corinth. 12,6 (God ὁ ἐνεγκὼν τὰ πάντα τὸν κόσμον) and Galat. 3,28.

in 391¹⁾ the worship of the pagan gods continued at Philae, the principal sanctuary of Isis on the borders of Ethiopia^{2).}

The Mother Goddess of ancient Egypt was to the Greeks the symbol of the fertility of the Nile valley. For centuries zoolatry had played a fundamental part in her worship, a fact which Patristic writers were quick to emphasize³. She took the likeness of a cow as Horus her son did of a hawk and her consort Anubis of a jackal or dog⁴. After the death of Alexander the cult of the Egyptian deities was deliberately propagated by Ptolemy Soter and in this process Isis underwent a remarkable spiritualisation and refinement. About this development, as might be expected, Christian writers have little enough to tell us. It is a fact that during the early days of Christianity the matriarchal theology of the Isiac faith found adherents in every part of the Empire – in Rome and Athens and elsewhere in Italy and Greece, in Gaul, Spain and Germany, in Britain at Londinium and in Asia Minor at Ephesus⁵. Isis was the divine power that asserted itself monotheistically over the whole human race⁶. As the deification of maternal love (*Ἄγαρη θεῶν*)⁷, Isis could afford to the female half of it hitherto undreamt-of hope, and to all the hope of salvation⁸. She was a very present help to those who called upon her to take pity: *ἔλθέ μοι, θεὰ θεῶν θλεως γνωμένη, ἐπάκουσον εἰλέησον*⁹. The cult of Isis, the friend of the proletariat, the downtrodden and

¹ See Gibbon Decline and Fall, ch. XXVIII.

² See Peirce and Tyler, L'Art Byzantin I, 102.

³ Cf. also Dill op. cit. 571.

⁴ Tertullian more than once mocks at Anubis (Apol. and Ad Nat.) the ‘dog-headed friend’. For Hermanubis in the Isiac procession cf. Apul. Metam. 274,20: *canis cervices arduas, Anubis, laeua caduceum gerens*. In Hermanubis I am sure can be found the forerunner of St. Christopher. So P. Saintyves.

⁵ The evidence is elaborately set forth by W. Drexler in Roscher's Lexicon.

⁶ Her rôle was that of a Madonna – *Δέσποινα* – *Domina elementorum omnium* (Apul. Metam. 269,13).

⁷ POxy. 1380.109, of the 2nd. cent. A. D. As a loving mother she sympathised with the sorrows of the unfortunate (*dulcem matris affectionem miserorum casibus tribuis* Apul. Metam. 286,21) and could intervene in a difficult situation when every natural means seemed impossible (Lafaye, Hist. du culte, 76). Cf. also Ovid, Met. IX, 699: *Dea sum auxiliaris opemque Exorata fero*.

⁸ For the “hope of salvation” cf. Apul. Metam. 266,21. It is also worth comparing ibid. 282,12 *spe futura* and 11,19–20 *meam differens instantiam spei melioris solaciis* with Romans 15,4: “That we through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope.”

⁹ Louvre Pap. 51,24 (166 B. C.). Cited by Plew, De Sarapide 32.

the slaves as well as of the Emperor and the wealthy, made the same universal appeal as the faith first propagated to the gentiles by Saint Paul¹.

Certain other elements of Isiac doctrine recall characteristic passages of the New Testament. Of fundamental importance in Pauline theology are (1) man's service to God – to "righteousness" – as a consequence of salvation from sin, (2) man's perfect freedom as the fruit of this service, and (3) spiritual rebirth by sanctification and faith². All this can be paralleled in the worship of Isis. She is herself personified under the name of Righteousness – *Δικαιοσύνη*³. She is a Holy and Universal Redeemer that will abide forever: *Sancta et humani generis sospitatrix perpetua*⁴. Her votary during his life on earth wins her as his Divine Advocate by faith⁵ and after he has descended into Hell he sees her there giving light to him in his darkness and in the shadow of death⁶. Isis it is who "banishes life's storms" and "tramples down Hell"⁷. So St. Paul writes of Evil crushed down: "The God of peace shall trample Satan under your feet".⁸

Had I been a pagan inquirer with some knowledge of the life of Christ as recorded in the Gospels, the Nativity in the manger would have reminded me of the Isis story⁹. The Flight into Egypt

¹ The conception of "the household of faith" (Galat. 6,10) is known to the humble Lucius, who calls himself *religionis indigena* (Apul. op. cit. 287,30) and about whom people could say that he had won Isis as his Heavenly Advocate through leading a blameless and harmless life and through Faith (*vita praecedens innocentia fideque*) so that after a process of rebirth he might devote himself to the service of the Isiac rites (*ut renatus quodam modo statim sacrorum obsequio desponderetur*) op. cit. 278,10–13. All this may be compared with e. g. Philippians 2,15–17.

² See Rom. 8,2. 12,1–2. 7,4–5.

³ SIG 1131. IG 3,203. See further Dieter Müller op. cit. 42.

⁴ Apul. op. cit. 286,20. For "the Redeemer that abides forever" cf. 272,23 and 277,22.

⁵ See n. 1. above The words used by the Isiac priest just before (loc. cit. 277,24 sqq.) recall Romans 6,18 and 22.

⁶ Apul. op. cit. 271,3. The use of *interlucentem* is a clear indication that Isis is here equated with *Ἄρτεμις φάντρος*. See Roussel, Annales de l'Est (1914–1916), 279, and Farnell, Cults, II, 586, with the quotation of Anth. Pal. VI 267.

⁷ Apul. op. cit. 286,29. Lafaye (op. cit. 138) points out that the sentence in which this occurs forms a kind of hymn like those since composed to the Blessed Virgin Mary.

⁸ Rom. 16,20. The *inferum claustra* in Apul. 283,6 can be compared with *πύλαι φόνοι* of Matthew 16,18.

⁹ Cf. Statius 3,2,101: *Isi Phoroneis quondam stabulata sub antris.*

might have impressed me with its Septuagint quotation "Out of Egypt have I called my Son"¹ and it would have interested me (if acquainted with the Egyptian deities) that Jesus being weary had sat down by a well² as both Isis and Demeter were said to have done³. The words used by Our Lord "Now glorify me, Father" might have recalled the formula: "Lady Isis, glorify me, as I glorified the name of thy son, Horus".⁴

Between the Isiac ritual and the usages of Eastern and Western Catholicism are to be found resemblances, some striking, some commonplace⁵. Two daily services — *bis die*⁶ — were regularly held. The likeness of the goddess was the object of silent contemplation. Holy water was sprinkled in the temple and confessions were heard⁷. The Aghiorite monks in their black robes are like the Isiac priests on Delos, *Μελανήφοροι*⁸. Both in the temples of Isis and in the churches of the West we meet professional clergy clad in white linen surplices⁹. The *pastophoroi* carrying a small replica of the goddess and the *paianistae* singing her hymns have their counterpart in the Christian Church¹⁰. The

¹ Matth. 2,15; Hos. 11,1.

² John 4,6.

³ Plut. Is. Os. 537 a.

⁴ John 17,5. A. E. Brooke in citing the passage (Peake, Comm. Bible,¹) remarks "a curious parallel". The "glory" of Isis for educated paganism was great, as is shown by the respect for her on the part of Plotinus (the Iseum at Rome was "the only holy place" the Egyptian priest who took him there could find in that city: Vit. Plot. 10) and Proclus (who composed a hymn in her honour: Vit. Procl. 19). The passage is in Gk. Pap. B. M. CXXI 502–504.

⁵ The importance of Jewish practice for Christianity must not be forgotten.

⁶ Tibullus I, 3,31 (Dill op. cit. 577, n. 3).

⁷ Ovid, Pont. I, 1,50 (Cumont, Rel. or⁴,218).

⁸ Cf. Lafaye op. cit. 147. Cumont (op. cit. 241) points out that from the Isiac ministers the black dress or cassock passed to the monks of the East and was transmitted to the Benedictines. It is an interesting speculation whether Christian Athos is under any direct debt to pagan Delos!

⁹ Cf. Martial 12,29,19; Apul. op. cit. 273,19: *lineae uestis candore puro luminosi*.

¹⁰ For these two categories of Isiac ministrants see Lafaye op. cit. 137 and Dill op. cit. 565. The "shrines" of the "pastophoroi" appear to have been in close proximity to the churches of the early Christians (Lafaye, 151, n. 1). If in fact the pastophoroi carried small images about in the likeness of temples then the practice can be paralleled in the Orthodox Church. For I have myself observed censers at Aghiou Dionysiou on Mount Athos being carried around with replicas of churches engraved on them and being rattled rhythmically in transit.

monastic tonsure¹, the use of the rattle at church services in Abyssinia² and of the simantron on Athos, the ringing of the Sanctus Bell during Mass, all accord with Isiac practice. St. Paul's remark that "it is right to do without flesh and wine"³ agrees exactly with the order given by the priest of Isis to the candidate for initiation *neque ullum animal essem et inuinius essem*.⁴ Lastly, the *Navigium Isidis*, the sailing away of a figure of the goddess in a boat, can be paralleled in the ritual of the Orthodox Church⁵.

Direct references to Isis by Patristic writers are not frequent. Clement of Alexandria acknowledges her antiquity, identifies her with the Greek Io and by a fanciful derivation declares the meaning of her name to be "ubiquitous"⁶. Eusebius who mentions Isis several times converts her into Artemis by identifying each with Selene, the Moon Goddess⁷. Epiphanius has no doubt that the Greeks "borrowed" their worship of Isis from Egypt⁸. Augustine following Varro accepts the identification with Io and evidently regards Isis as a great civilising influence, for to her he ascribes the invention of literature⁹.

¹ The Eastern (or St. Paul's) tonsure, in which the whole head is shaven, resembles the Isiac rite. Is there any significance in St. Paul's having shorn his head at Cenchreæ (Acts 18,18) in consequence of "a vow"? Here was a celebrated Temple of Isis and here it was that Lucius came to be initiated into her mysteries.

² The use of the rattle is typical of Isiac worship: the *sistrum* is the emblem of the goddess (e. g. on the S. W. pillar of the Arch of Galerius at Thessalonika Isis stands holding one in her hand — cf. Kinch, L'Arc de Triomphe, 27). Legge (op. cit. I, 86, n. 4) calls attention to this fact. In the words of Alan H. Gardiner: "It is an interesting and perhaps not universally known fact that the sistrum is still used at the present day in the churches of Abyssinia."

³ Romans 14,21.

⁴ Apul. op. cit. 284,32.

⁵ See Lafaye op. cit. 210 with references to S. Maria Navicella, and Dill op. cit. 579. I have gazed at the ikon of the Panaghia exposed for veneration at the lakeside after transport by boat on the Feast of the Koimesis (Aug. 15) from Castoria in N. W. Greece.

⁶ Strom. I, 106,1.

⁷ Praep. Ev. 96. The identification is of course of great importance for my present purpose. Roscher's Lexicon s. v. Isis (article by Drexler) p. 438 reproduces from an inscription *Isidi Lunae Diana* as well as a citation from Julian (Ep. 51) identifying Isis and the Moon. (Cleopatra styled herself by these alternative names: cf. Lafaye op. cit. 144). We must remember Artemis as the Moon Goddess: cf. Browning's "Through heaven I roll my lucid moon along" (Artemis Prologizes). It is precisely the equation of Isis with Artemis as such that has hitherto attracted insufficient attention.

⁸ Migne PG 41,199.

⁹ Civ. D. 18,3.

From what the Christian Fathers themselves have to say on the subject we might conclude that the cult of Isis had little or no bearing on their own religion. The discovery of resemblances in faith and worship was certainly not their concern. Yet the parallels I have mentioned are there for all to see. Nor is that the end.

With the winning by Ptolemy Soter of an international vogue for the Egyptian gods the functions of Isis enormously increased. By the Second Century of our Era¹ she could be identified with any or all of the mutually dissimilar female occupants of the Greco-Roman Pantheon. Not for nothing was she termed the deity "of countless names" — *μυρώνυμος*². The original interpretation of Isis as a fertility goddess had been straightforward: For Herodotus it had simply entailed equating her with Demeter³. Centuries later, when she was taken across the sea as *Isis Pelagia* she acquired certain attributes (as has been well pointed out by Frazer) which were quite foreign to her original character. Among these was an association — and even identification — with Artemis-Diana-Selene-Hecate, which as has been mentioned was recognised by Eusebius but which has not been generally appreciated by modern scholars⁴.

The union of Mother and Virgin must seem strange at first. How can the notion of maternal fecundity be harmonised with that of perpetual chastity? Artemis was the young unwedded huntress of the woodlands (*'Αγορέα*)⁵ whereas Isis as mature wife and mother traditionally portrayed the virtues of home life. It must be remembered, nevertheless, that another Artemis existed in the Greek world, namely at Ephesus. There, as Eusebius informs us⁶, she was worshipped "not as the huntress holding the bow" but "as the nurse of all that lives." The extant statue of this Ephesian Artemis shows her with a multitude of breasts and with a robe adorned by heads of animals⁷. Macrobius, who

¹ See p. 135, note 2. It may be noted that centuries earlier she had been narrowly restricted by Herodotus — identified by him with Demeter but regarded as Artemis' mother.

² Plut. Is. Os. 372f. OGI 695. Apul. 284,11: *multinominis*.

³ 2,59.

⁴ Cf. Cumont op. cit. 83; Dalmeida, ed. Xenophon of Ephesus, p. XVII.

⁵ My friend Fr. Paul of the Athonite Monastery of Lavra recently drew my attention to an inscription in honour of this Artemis on the lintel (of all places!) above the entrance to the monks' Trapezaria.

⁶ Migne PG 26, 441.

⁷ The statue is in the National Museum of Naples.

flourished about 400 A. D., apparently had no difficulty in accepting such a representation as that of Isis herself, about whom he explicitly writes: *Continuatis uberibus corpus deae omne densemetur.*¹

One clue to the *rapprochement* between Isis and Artemis may be found in the dual rôle played in Hellenistic times by the Egyptian goddess Bubastis. Bubastis (otherwise Bastet or Bast²) had been identified by Herodotus with Artemis³, but in the later period she was linked with the all-embracing cult of Isis⁴, with whom she could be equated⁵. Bubastis, like Artemis and Ilithyia, presided over maternity and childbirth⁶, and was accordingly an object of special veneration for women, both in the Egyptian city over which she eponymously presided in company with Isis⁷ and elsewhere. Isis in a well-known hymn addressed to her bears the epithet *Bούβαστος*⁸. By the process known as theocrasia Isis could be commingled both with Bubastis and with Artemis because of the contiguity of the shrines⁹. Inscriptions prove to us that the relationship between Isis and Bubastis could be either assimilation or absolute identification¹⁰.

The association between Egyptian Isis and Greek Artemis is known to have been very close on such islands as Crete and Delos.

¹ p. 116, 1.8 Eyssenhardt.

² See Bonnet, Real-Lex. aeg. Rel. Gesch. s. v. Bastet. Cf. also Rusch, De Serap. et Isid. 26.

³ 2,137.

⁴ Less positive than this view (Bonnet's) is that of Heinrich Schaefer ("Das Gewand der Isis", Janus, 1921, 205: "Vielleicht hat der Bubastiskult auch sonst auf den späteren Isiskult einigen Einfluß gehabt.")

⁵ Roussel op. cit. 198.

⁶ Perdrizet, Les terres cuites I, 13.

⁷ Cf. the quotation ibid. Ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ παρὰ γυναιξὶ θεός καλονυμένη, Ἐμοὶ Βούβαστις πόλις οἰκοδομήθη.

⁸ Hymn to Isis, ed. Peek, 1.3: σειστροφόρος Βόνβαστος.

⁹ Lafaye op. cit. 135: The two temples of Isis and Boubastis were contiguous. For the theocrasia cf. Legge, op. cit. I, 46. We know also that Isis was termed *Bouβάστια* at Canopus in Egypt and that a temple of Isis in Greece could be alongside one of Artemis (Paus. I, 41³).

¹⁰ For assimilation cf. Wessetzy (Acta Arch. 11, 275) *Isidi Augustae et Bubasti* and for identification ibid. (CIL 14, 21) "ISIDI BUBAS[TI] . . . DIODORA BUBASTIACA TESTAMENTO DEDIT." (from Ostia). Without necessarily accepting Prechar's emendation in "Ampeliana" (Rev. Arch. 1920, 239) we may note his remarks on the Isis-Artemis relationship: "Toutes deux finalement symbolisaient la nature féconde et nourricière." Ovid (Metam. 9, 689–692) has a list of four deities: Anubis, Bubastis, Apis and Osiris.

In the "Metamorphoses" of Apuleius the Cretans, Isis informs Lucius, *Dianam me appellant*¹. Somewhen about 109 B. C. a certain Athenian Philocrates as priest of Sarapis at Delos dedicated two votive tablets quite obviously to the triform goddess Isis-Artemis-Hecate². The epithet applied to the goddess is significantly *άγια*³. Philocrates is less concerned with other aspects of Isiac worship such as sacrament and communion, forgiveness of sin, regeneration and immortality⁴ than with ritual purification and chastity⁵.

Ephesus was the city where St. Paul's preaching led to a famous outburst on behalf of "great Artemis". When the town-clerk sought to calm down tempers by saying everybody knew what goddess was adored there he used an epithet which is a technical term in the cult both of Artemis and of Isis: *νεωκόρος*⁶. We know that as early as 262 B. C., when Ephesus became Ptolemaic, Isis (together with Sarapis, Anubis and the *σύρραιοι θεοί*) had been admitted into the city with an Artemision which was one of the wonders of the world⁷, and that in the Artemision Isis had her own altars⁸. At Ephesus, in fact, the cult of the Egyptian gods was added to that of Artemis⁹. Significantly, when Lucius at the beginning of the last book of the *Metamorphoses* is vouchsafed the vision of Isis the moon is rising full above the ocean and his opening words are *Regina caeli* which are to be linked with what soon follows: *Phoebi soror* and *Quae populos tantos educasti paeclarisque nunc ueneraris delubris Ephesi*¹⁰. Apuleius is not the only novelist to exhibit a belief that the functions

¹ Apul. 269,22.

² See Roussel op. cit. 190, nos. 179 (E 680) and 180 (A 1069). Ibid. p. 295: I... "In the Cyclades they called her *Τηφύην Ἀρτεμειν.*" So OP 1380,84.

³ Cf. Plut. Is. Os. 2 (cited Fehrle, Kult. Keuschh. Alt. 137); UPZ (Wilcken) 79,22 (159 B.C.) where two women invoke *Tήν Εἰσῶν τὴν ἀγίαν*; Dalmeyda Xen. Eph. 17 with discussion of *ἀγέλα πάσῃ καὶ νεωκόρᾳ*; Picard, Ephèse et Charos 361–362, with ref. to *"Ισις ἀγνῆ* in OP 1380.

⁴ All these aspects are touched upon in the relevant passages from Apuleius, e. g. pp. 277–278 op. cit.

⁵ Cf. ibid. *castimoniorum abstinentia* 281, 10.

⁶ Acts 19,35.

⁷ J. Keil, Wien. Anz. 1954, 217–228, cited P. M. Frazer, J. Egypt. Arch. 1956, 114.

⁸ Cf. Picard op. cit. 5.

⁹ A Hellenistic dedication has been found to Sarapis, Isis and Anubis (Benndorf, Ephesos I, 71, n. 4).

¹⁰ Apul. op. cit. 267,10 sqq.

of Ephesian Artemis and Alexandrian Isis coincide. Xenophon of Ephesus created as his heroine an Ephesian girl named Anthea whose father, she tells us, "dedicated her to Isis until her wedding day"¹. She invokes her own city's Artemis before her departure for Egypt, prays to Isis at Memphis as the goddess who maintains her purity and to whom she is dedicated² and finally enters the Artemision at Ephesus to offer votive gifts after her adventures³. It is clear that Isis is regarded no less than Artemis as the goddess of chastity. Her rôle is now that of purification.

This fact helps to explain why Christian churches were built at or near the sites of Isiac temples. The erection of each such edifice symbolised the triumph of one Chaste Mother over another. A good example is Santa Maria in Navicella at Rome with a name reminiscent of the *navigium Isidis*. Another is the Little (or Old) Mitropolis at Athens⁴. Here an interesting story is revealed by the two alternative names "St. Eleutherios" and "Gorgoepekoos". The former of these is derivable from Eleutho-Ilithyia whose temple close at hand was doubtless shared by Isis and in later times was pillaged for the building of the church which replaced it⁵. "Gorgoepekoos" – the modern Greek epithet "swift to hear" – is applied to the Virgin Mary not only in the name of this church but also in that of her ikon at the Monastery of Docheiariou on Mount Athos⁶.

It was at Ephesus that the dogma of the Virgin Theotokos was adopted through the exertions of Cyril of Alexandria in 431 to combat the dyophysite heresy of Nestorius. At that period the central problem for Christian theologians was the Incarnation – the Motherhood of the Child who was God. Having been born at Alexandria Cyril was well aware of the cult of Isis. Had he been a pagan he might well have adhered to it. The Isis of his day was both the age-old Egyptian Mother with Horus as her only son and (through her association with Bubastis/Artemis) universal

¹ Ed. Dalmeida III, 11,4 (with note).

² Ibid. I, 11, 1. ³ Ibid. V, 15, 2.

⁴ Perhaps 'Εκατόν πυλῶν at Paros should be included also.

⁵ G. Bart (in Eleuth. Enc. Lex. s. v.) roundly states it was built above "the ancient temple of Isis". Isis and the other Egyptian deities were both *σωτῆρες* and *ἐπήκοοι* (Roussel op. cit. 194.289). Cf. also opera cit. Rusch 42.5; Picard 366; Breccia 54 Μητρὶ θεῶν Σωτείρᾳ Ἐπηκόῳ.

⁶ In the gloom of the sanctuary when I saw it I was uncertain whether another face had been "painted out". For the *γογύστης* of Isis see Aristides in Hopfner, Fontes h. r. Aeg. 308³⁴.

Queen in earth, heaven and hell and the goddess of sexual purity and chastity. Isis for Cyril was the goddess in the precincts of whose temples heathen incubation was practised, a demon falsely supposed in his view to possess the power of healing the sick¹.

Cyril, we are told, chose as the burial place for the remains of St. Cyrus and St. John a site at Menouthis two miles from the eastern side of Canopus near the temple of the goddess there². The unnamed goddess was in fact none other than Isis, *Isis medica*³. Sophronius writes of the deity there as “a gloomy Egyptian demon”⁴ whose power Cyril “crushed”⁵. This unclean demon affecting the shape of a woman manifested itself in many apparitions⁶. Cyril’s declared purpose was to exorcize the “evil spirits” which were “plainly at work” (*ἐνέργεια*) in the idol. There he is recorded to have deposited relics in a coffin which had been made ready⁷, the same relics doubtless which as we are told by Eunapius were afterwards “haunted” by black-robed monks⁸.

All this proves Cyril’s acquaintance with the cult of Isis. The choice of Ephesus by the Patriarch of Alexandria as the meeting-place for the Third Ecumenical Council seems to me to have been determined by the fact that in that city a long tradition associating Artemis and Isis had prepared a church still largely paganised⁹ for the eager acceptance of the doctrine of the Virgin Mother of God. Ephesus was a peculiarly fit place for the Blessed Virgin Mary to win the prestige hitherto enjoyed by the two pagan goddesses in their conjoint hegemony¹⁰.

¹ Like Asklepios and Amphiaraus.

² PG 77, 1104. It was at a place to become famous for a moment in British history – Aboukir, *Ἄββα Κύρος* (see Anal. Boll. 30, 448 “Les Saints d’Aboukir”). St. Cyrus may be the Christian successor both of *Κύριος Σάραπις* (CIG 3163) and of *Κύριος Ἀσκλήπιος* (POxy. 110,2).

³ See Lumbroso, *L’Egitto dei Greci* 147–153.

⁴ PG 87, 3409: *Δαίμων τις ζωφερός καὶ Αἰγύπτιος*.

⁵ Ibid. 3412: *τοῦ μὲν δαίμονος ἔθρανσεν τὴν ἐνέργειαν, τοῦ δὲ λαοῦ τὴν ἀσθένειαν ἔθεράπενσεν*.

⁶ Ibid. 3409: *Μενονθῆς τούτομα . . . θήλεως μορφὴν προσποιούμενος* and 3693: *δαίμων διάθαρος ἐπεράντετο ἐν εἰδεὶ θηλείας ποιῶν φαντασίας πολλάς*.

⁷ Ibid. 3695.

⁸ The “relic-worship” is attacked by Eunapius as taking place at Canopus: Vit. Soph. VI, 2,6–8 (p. 39 Giangrande).

⁹ See W. M. Ramsay, *Studies in the History of Art* 375.

¹⁰ Cf. Picard op. cit. 707.

Scholars today need to ask what are the significant resemblances between Isiac worship and Christianity. It is also a worth-while task to establish as exactly as possible what were the relations between Isis and Artemis and how well Cyril knew these two deities. These are among the preliminary questions we must raise in considering how important is the cult of Isis for Patristic studies¹.

¹ My further views about Isiac influences on Christianity will appear in an article "Isis-Hellas" to be published this year in Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society.

VII. LITURGICA

H. ASHWORTH
L. BOUYER
AMY KEY CLARKE
C. COEBERGH
J. D. CRICHTON
K. GAMBER
S. M. GIBBARD
P. W. HARKINS
J. HENNIG
J. JANINI
R. P. MARTIN
E. C. RATCLIFF
R. J. SCHORK
H. E. SYMONDS
T. F. TAYLOR
E. THEODOROU
S. J. P. VAN DIJK

The Relationship between Liturgical Formularies and Patristic Texts

H. ASHWORTH, O. S. B., Quarr

The discovery of the existence of literary parallels between liturgical formularies and patristic texts is a fairly recent one and dates especially from the last few decades. Earlier writers could happily discuss problems concerning, for example, the so-called *Gregorian Sacramentary* without feeling any urgent need to examine at the same time the works of St Gregory the Great with an eye to similarity of thought, phraseology and style. Fortunately this is now changed or in the process of changing, and the literary aspect of the problem, delicate though its use may sometimes be, is coming to take its rightful place in such liturgical and historical investigation. It may be useful, therefore, to review briefly the ground which has so far been covered, taking as the basis of our inquiry the three main ancient sacramentaries – the so-called Leonine, Gelasian and Gregorian – and then to pass some general comments on the problems and difficulties that have arisen.

I. With regard to the *Leonine Sacramentary*, a few of its texts have been linked with the works of St Augustine¹. Attempts have also been made to find literary parallels between its formularies and the works of *St Leo the Great*: the names which most readily come to mind in this connection are those of Mgr. Callewaert, one of the great pioneers in this field, Fr. A. Lang, Dom B. Capelle, Dom H. Frank, Dom C. Coebergh. All the relevant bibliography on this matter up to 1958 was presented by Dom E. Dekkers in an article in *Sacris Erudiri*². Parallels have like-

¹ Dom Louis Brou, Un passage de S. Augustin dans une oraison du sacramentaire Léonien, *Downside Review*, 1946, 39–42; A. Chavasse, Messes du pape Vigile dans le sacramentaire Léonien, *Ephem. Liturg.* 66, 1952, 166 n. 53 b.

² Autour de l'œuvre liturgique de s. Léon le Grand, *Sacris Erudiri* 10, 1958, 363–398.

wise been found between texts of the Leonine and the writings of Pope Gelasius I: here it is the names of Dom Coebergh¹, Dom Capelle and Canon Chavasse which are to the fore – particularly the first mentioned. – For the connection between the prayer formularies and the letters of Pope *Vigilius* the principal study on which we depend is that of Canon Chavasse².

II. In connection with the Gelasian Sacramentary, a preface³ (for the Octave of Christmas) has been shewn to derive from a sermon of *St Augustine*, the authenticity of which, though long in doubt, has now been fully vindicated by Dom C. Lambot⁴. – Dr. Klaus Gamber has tried to discover literary parallels between some of the prayers in the Sacramentary and the works of *Paulinus of Nola*⁵. Further connections with Pope *Leo the Great* have been put forward by Fr Lang, Dom Capelle and others: the relevant bibliography on this is again available in Dom Dekker's study mentioned above⁶. Dom S. Benz and Dom A. Olivari⁷ have pointed to a link between a text of the Gelasian and a Sermon of *St Peter Chrysologus*. – Dom Germain Morin suggested a possible parallel between the Easter preface of the Gelasian and a sermon of *St Caesarius of Arles*⁸. He likewise indicated that five of the

¹ Dom C. Coebergh, *St Gérase auteur principal du soi-disant sacramentaire Léonien*, *Ephem. Liturg.* 64, 1950, 214–237; 65, 1951, 171–181; id., *Le pape saint Gérase I^{er} auteur de plusieurs messes et préfaces du soi-disant sacramentaire léonien*, *Sacris Erudiri* 4, 1952, 46–102.

² A. Chavasse, *Messes du Pape Vigile (537–555) dans le Sacramentaire Léonien*, *Ephem. Liturg.* 64, 1950, 161–213; 66, 1952, 145–215. (It is this second part which deals specifically with the literary parallels.)

³ N° 51 of Mohlberg's edition.

⁴ L'Authenticité du sermon 369 de S. Augustin pour la fête de Noël, in: *Colligere Fragmenta* (Festschrift Alban Dold, Beuron 1952), 103–112. It is worth noting that two readings (*qui natus est* for *quem peperit* and *praesepium* for *praeceps*) link the Gelasian (Reginensis 316) with Paris B. N. lat. 15683 [s. IX] and Cambrai 365 [s. X] respectively – i. e. with MSS which appear to be of French origin.

⁵ Das Kampanische Meßbuch als Vorläufer des Gelasianum, *Sacris Erudiri* 12, 1961, 5–111: on the literary parallels see especially pp. 21–42, 85–87.

⁶ Supra p. 149 n. 2. Two further studies by Fr. A. Lang have appeared since this was published: Leo der Große und die liturgischen Texte des Oktavtages von Epiphanie, *Sacris Erudiri* 11, 1960, 12–135; Anklänge an Orationen der Ostervigil in den Sermonen Leos des Großen, *Sacris Erudiri* 13, 1962, 281–325.

⁷ Dom S. Benz, Die Texte der römischen Taufwasserweihe, *Rev. Bén.* 66, 1956, 218–255; Dom A. Olivari, San Pedro Crisólogo, Autor del Texto de la Benediccion de la Fuentes Bautismales? *Ephem. Liturg.* 71, 1957, 280–292.

⁸ Sancti Caesarii Opera, Sermo 85 = CC 103, 351–352.

prayers "super defunctae corpus" appended from a very early date (VIth c?) to the Rule of St Caesarius occur also in the Gelasian¹. – In a recent article I indicated a textual link between a collect of the Sacramentary and a Homily of *Valerian of Cimiez*².

III. Concerning the Gregorian Sacramentary Dom Capelle was the first to point out some of the parallels between a few of its formularies and the works of *St Gregory the Great*³. I then took up this line of investigation and tried to shew that at least some 80 prayers of the Sacramentary possessed close literary affinities with Gregory's authentic works⁴.

It does not need a long acquaintance with the works of the various scholars above mentioned, to become aware of the large measure of disagreement which prevails among them. Where one, for example, sees a connection between a liturgical formulary and the works of St Leo, another believes this connection is with Pope Gelasius. Even in cases where there is agreement about the existence of a literary parallel there may remain wide divergence concerning its direct implications. Thus, to take another example, where Dom Benz thinks the parallel proves St Peter Chrysologus' authorship of a Leonine text, Dom Olivar suggests that this same parallel indicates nothing more than Chrysologus' familiarity with the liturgical prayer. Dom E. Dekkers is no doubt right when he suggests that the large measure of disagreement which is so apparent, is due mainly to the fact that new ground is being broken and that the appropriate techniques, which will lead to sure conclusions, have not yet been fully worked out⁵. It is, however, possible, to discern in several recent studies a

¹ S. Caesari Regula Sanctorum Uirginum, Florilegium Patristicum Vol. 34, Bonn 1933, 30–31.

² Dom H. Ashworth, A Passage from Valerian of Cimiez and a Collect from the Gelasian Sacramentary, *The Heythrop Journal* 3, 1962, 271–275.

³ Dom B. Capelle, La Préface de Noël, Questions liturgiques et paroissiales 18, 1936, 273–283; id., La Préface de l'Ascension, ib. 21, 1936, 73–83; id., La Main de S. Grégoire dans le Sacramentaire Grégorien, *Rev. Bén.* 49, 1937, 13–28.

⁴ Dom H. Ashworth, The Influence of the Lombard Invasions on the Gregorian Sacramentary, *Bull. John Rylands Library* 36, 1954, 305–327; id., The Liturgical Prayers of St Gregory the Great, *Traditio* 15, 1959, 107–161; id., Further Parallels to the 'Hadrianum' from St Gregory the Great's Commentary on Kings, *Traditio* 16, 1960, 264–273.

⁵ *Sacris Erudiri* 10, 1953, 373.

growing note of caution and a growing awareness of the complexities of the problems involved.

Where literary parallels can be established between a liturgical text and a patristic writing three possibilities present themselves: (1) the patristic writing inspired the composition of the liturgical formulary. In some instances no other possibility need be envisaged: for example in the case of parallels between the texts of St Augustine and prayers from the later Roman Sacramentaries¹: (2) the patristic text was inspired by a pre-existing liturgical prayer; (3) the patristic and liturgical texts are due to the same author. — It is not always easy to decide which of these solutions is the correct one. This is particularly true when only a handful of textual parallels can be established and the historical evidence is "neutral". In cases where a whole series of parallels can be brought to light, there seems more chance of forming an accurate judgment, particularly if the patristic texts are fairly extensive. For it is then possible, through a detailed study, to determine more precisely the idiosyncracies of vocabulary and style of a given author. In this respect Canon Chavasse has rightly pointed out the caution that is necessary in such cases². The stylistic study must normally be linked with one dealing with the thought of the writer, and an attempt be made to assess its true character and originality. The cases which seem to offer the best grounds for solid conclusions are those concerning St Leo, Pope Vigilius and St Gregory. Since I am more familiar with the works of the last named I may be permitted here a few brief remarks concerning the textual parallels between the Gregorian Sacramentary and St Gregory. Dom Jean Leclercq, in a note to one of his articles, suggested that the prayer *Actiones nostras* of the Gregorian Sacramentary was inspired by numerous authentic texts of St Gregory, and he treated this case as one similar to the Augustinian influence discernible here and there in the *Leonianum*³. It may be that a writer who thus comes across an isolated instance will prefer the first of the three possible solutions mentioned above. This solution no longer

¹ Very little work has so far been done on this subject, but the few points of contact already established (cf. *supra* p. 149 n. 1) suggest that this would be a fruitful field for investigation.

² Cf. *Ephem. Liturg.* 66, 1952, 164–165; 204–207.

³ Cf. *Une Homélie-Prière sur le Saint-Esprit*, *Rev. Asc. et Myst.* 24, 1948, 82 n. 9.

appears the most likely one when a detailed investigation has been begun and the discovery made how very striking and extensive the literary parallels between the *Gregorianum* and St. Gregory's works really are. What is particularly noticeable is the fact that while it is the same vocabulary, manner of phrasing, ideas which occur in both series of texts, there is no slavish borrowing from one to the other¹. Everything suggests that it is the same author who is at work². This conclusion, however, to identity of authorship for both series, does not of itself exclude the possibility that the list of 80 odd Gregorian prayers may contain a few instances of prayers anterior to Gregory which influenced his thought and style. But unless incontrovertible proof can be offered for the anteriority of the prayer, it is well nigh impossible now to distinguish such instances from the remainder which Gregory composed. A case in point is the small number of Gregorian formularies found in the Gelasian Sacramentary³.

A further point concerning the Gregorian texts in the *Gregorianum* is worth making. I cannot offer any guarantee that my list of over 80 odd prayers is absolutely complete. The difficulties which at present beset such an investigation need to be remembered: for, although we possess a few fairly good *indices* of the vocabulary of liturgical formularies, there is a great dearth of satisfactory patristic *indices* which list *in extenso* the vocabulary and mannerisms of a particular Father⁴. One must therefore

¹ This is in contrast to some of the Augustine parallels for the *Leonianum* and *Gelasianum* where there are quite evident cases of plagiarism.

² Even when one has established Gregory's authorship of the prayers, this still leaves intact the problem of whether or not he composed a Sacramentary: see my paper Did St. Gregory compose a Sacramentary? in: *Studia Patristica* 2 (TU 64), Berlin 1957, 3–16, and the Introduction to *The Liturgical Prayers of Pope Gregory I*, *Traditio* 15, 1959, 107–118; also *Traditio* 16, 1960, 364 n. 4.

³ Cf. Dom H. Ashworth, *Gregorian Elements in the Gelasian Sacramentary*, *Ephem. Liturg.* 67, 1953, 9–23. Even after A. Chavasse's investigations into the *Gelasianum* (in which hypothesis plays a very large part) it is still far from certain that *Reginensis* 316 could not contain Gregorian elements: for instance, we know through St Aldhelm, a near contemporary, that Gregory added the names of Agatha and Lucy in the Canon, cf. *De Virginitate* XLII (MGH, p. 293); these are also found in *Reginensis* 316.

⁴ Thus the long index to the MGH edition of St Gregory's *Registrum* is useful for what it gives; but numerous are the typically Gregorian words and expressions not listed by L. Wenger, as for example, the expressions *vigilanti studio*, *cura*, *solllicitudo* etc. which occur frequently under Gregory's pen. *Vigilanti studio* occurs in the Ninth Century Sacramentaries of Angoulême and

warmly welcome the projected *Clavis Augustiniana* announced by the editors of *Corpus Christianorum* and long for the day when a similar *Clavis* covering the works of other Fathers will be available. Meanwhile the scholar engaged on such work must depend mainly on the retentiveness of his memory — always a fallible instrument — as he sets about trying to spot the presence of a familiar liturgical phrase in the patristic corpus.

A final remark on the subject of the relationship between liturgical formularies and patristic texts may be allowed. So far the efforts of those taking part in this digging up of the past have been mainly concentrated within the confines of papal literature and Roman liturgical books. The investigation would undoubtedly gain if it were conducted over a much wider area. As Dom P. Verbraken rightly remarks, the ancient Fathers were “pétris de Bible et de Liturgie”¹ and it would be surprising if liturgical as well as biblical references were not unearthed. While such discoveries may not always throw light on the authorship of liturgical texts they could do much to give us a more accurate picture of the diffusion of the early *Libelli Sacramentorum*. The case of Valerian of Cimiez, quoting the Gelasian collect *Deus virtutum cuius est totum quod est optimum*, is not an isolated one². One could also point to a literary parallel between the *Epistola ad Demetriadem* and the collect *Deus auctor pacis et amator* from the same Sacramentary³; to another parallel between the work of Prosper of Aquitaine and a prayer from the *Leonianum*⁴; Again, Montanus, the sixth century bishop

Padua, in the collect *Deus virtutum cuius est totum quod est optimum*. The expression is absent from the *Leonianum* but it is in the text of the *Gelasianum*, Wilson, p. 225, f. Mohlberg 1182 *vigilantia studium*.

¹ Cf. Rev. Bén. 67, 1957, 115.

² Cf. supra p. 151 and n. 2.

³ Epist. ad Demetriadem, cap. 4 (PL 55, 165): *Sed ad ipsum omnium visibilium et invisibilium ambiant creatorem: cui appropinquare clarescere est; quem timere gaudere est, cui servire regnare est.*

Sacramentarium Gelasianum (Edit. Mohlberg 1476; Wilson, III, 56): *Deus auctor pacis et amator quem nosse vivere, cui servire regnare est, protege ab omnibus inpugnationibus supplices tuos, ut qui defensione tua fidemus, nullius hostilitatis arma timeamus.*

⁴ Sacramentarium Leonianum (Edit. Mohlberg 77; Feltoe 9): *Vere dignum: cuius ecclesia sic veris confessoribus falsisque permixta nunc agitur, ut tamen et fragilitatis humanae semper cavenda mutatio et nullius sit desperanda conversio. Quo magis supplices te rogamus, ut quia sine te non potest solida constare devotio, et firmis perseverantiam et resipiscientiam largixris infirmis: per . . .*

of Toledo (522–531), reminds his delinquent priests of their ordination in terms which are reminiscent of the old Leonine ordination formulary¹. The field for research is vast and the enquiry has hardly begun.

Prosper of Aquitaine: *De Vocatione Omnis Gentium II 37*, (PL 51, 722):
Dum enim in hoc corpore vivitur, nullius est negligenda correctio, nullius est desperanda reparatio. Oret itaque sancta Ecclesia, et pro eis qui crediderunt gratias agens, proficiemt eis perseverantiam petat; pro iis autem qui extra fidem sunt, poscat ut credant.

¹ Montanus Epist. I 3 (PL 65, 52): *Revolvatur manibus vestris, o presbyteri, sacratissimus Numeri liber in quo vestri officii in septuaginta seniorum personis auspicatus est honor; et invenietis quorum negotiorum vobis praerogativa concessa sit. Adiutores vos Deus nostri laboris secundo dignitatis gradu esse voluit, non temeratores sacrarum quarundam rerum esse permisit.*

Cf. *Sacramentarium Veronense* (Edit. Mohlberg 954, Feltoe 122): *Unde sacerdotales grados et officia levitarum sacramentis mysticis instituta creverunt; ut cum pontifices summos regendis populis praefecisses, ad eorum societas et operis adiumentum sequentis ordinis viros et secundae dignitatis elegeres. Sic in eremo per septuaginta virorum prudentium mentes Mose spiritum propagasti; quibus ille adiutoribus usus in populo, innumeras multitudines facile gubernavit.*

The Different Forms of Eucharistic Prayer and their Genealogy

L. BOUYER Cong. Orat., Paris

Among the documents that have come to us from the patristic era few are so important as the great eucharistic prayers, generally called 'anaphora' in the East, 'canon of the mass' in the Latin, and more especially in the Roman, tradition. However, it is well known that these prayers confront us with irreducible differences together with striking analogies, both in their structures and contents. Hence a first problem: What in them may be considered as primitive or essential, and what is only the product of a secondary development, more or less particular to some or other local Church? The said development might, on the other hand, just as well have been a natural growth of primitive elements, a mere addition of something foreign to these elements, or the withering or even the complete disappearance of some of them. Are we, to give a few examples, to consider the liturgical use of the Words of Institution as primitive or not? The same could be asked concerning what is called the epiclesis, or concerning the sanctus, or the presence of more or less lengthy intercessions within the eucharistic prayer itself.

This first problem soon leads to a second one, still more difficult to solve. What is properly an epiclesis? Or again, What is distinctively eucharistic in the prayers we are speaking of? Thus we pass from the problem of the primitive structure of the eucharistic prayer to that of its contents, or, what is the same in other words, the problem of the meaning of the different elements of which it is made.

For a long time it has been supposed that all these problems could be solved at once if only we could put our finger, if not on the letter of the most primitive eucharistic prayer, at least on its scheme. What was the pattern of the eucharistic prayer used by the apostles themselves? The Protestant Reformers believed more or less that the whole of the primitive eucharist was expli-

citly given to us in the words of its institution. Therefore the ideal eucharist would be that in which nothing would be added to them, the whole canon of the mass, apart from that central part, being seen as a later and spurious addition. They did not realize themselves how much, in thinking in that way, they remained dependent on the Latin medieval speculations, putting the whole reality of the eucharist in these words alone, and practically neglecting all that comes before or after them, as being only, as saint Gregory the Great said already, the work of *scholasticus quidam*.

The liturgists of the XVIIth century, and more especially the Anglican ones, reacted strongly against such a view. For most of them the "apostolic eucharist" could be found in its fullness in the so-called 'Clementine liturgy', i. e. in the eucharist as described in the eighth book of the *Apostolic Constitutions*. There were certainly combined in this view a right apprehension of some of the most primitive features of the eucharistic prayer, together with an illusion on the apostolic authority of the text considered, — an illusion which was soon to fade away, not however without leaving lasting traces in the minds of even very critical scholars.

Nevertheless, the hunt after the "apostolic eucharist" was to be resumed. Until quite recently one adventurer after another engaged in the quest would tell the world that he at last had hit upon the elusive goal. Think only of Dom Paul Cagin and his "anaphore apostolique", supposed to be, this time, the eucharistic prayer of saint Hippolytus as found in the *Traditio apostolica*, or still more recently of no less enthusiastic commentators on the liturgy of Adai and Mari.

Even scholars who think that the search for *one* primitive text is only running after a ghost remain persuaded that out of some especially archaic documents it might be possible at least to reconstruct a scheme of the primitive or essential eucharist, according to which all the formularies now extant could and should be appraised or discarded, or if possible remodelled for ideal use in an ideal Church. A fine example of this can be found in the book, extremely interesting and valuable as it is, *The Anaphora or Great Eucharistic Prayer* by Bishop Walter Frere, and there is certainly much of it still lingering even in such a cautious book as *Missarum Sollemnia* by Father Josef Jungmann.

Now it must be frankly said that in all the reconstructions of that kind the supposedly ideal scheme is only a mixed product of the theological views on the eucharist entertained in the Church or school of the author, brought to a dubious coalescence with the texts of Christian antiquity. But as most of the eucharistic theologies, of whatever Church or school, from the middle ages until now have been built on anything but the liturgical texts themselves, the least that can be said is that they do not speak the same language, so that the alleged reconstructions will be of the same kind as those reconstructions of ideal Gothic buildings by people like Viollet-le-Duc or Wyatt, which only succeeded in finally disfiguring what had remained until then of the real ones. As long as we come to the texts already persuaded that we know, before we begin to study them, what is or should be a proper eucharistic consecration, or anamnesis, or epiclesis, or any such thing, we shall do nothing else but crush the texts on Procrustean beds of our own making.

However, it is easier to denounce the fallacy than to find a practical way to avoid it. The only sure way would be a genetic study of the historically different forms of the eucharistic prayer, leading to a phenomenology of the notions and realities embedded in them. But the fragmentary nature of the documents, in spite of its richness and variety, does not allow us to do that in a purely objective way. There are too many gaps, and the worst thing is that the further back we go, the more numerous and the wider they are, so that we cannot avoid hypotheses or mere guesses.

What we can and should do at least is to see first whether all the texts we have could not be classified between different groups or families, exhibiting not only analogous features but an ascertainable community of formation. Only after that could be raised the question of the possible relationship between those different groups, whether they can be supposed to depend one upon the other, or whether they could have had rather some common ancestors, and which. Then, together with that fundamental study, based in part upon it but soon reacting in turn upon it also, could be undertaken a semantic study of the key words and notions which are as the knots of the leading ideas we should try to discover in the line of evolution of the eucharistic prayer rather than impose upon it from outside.

In other words, we must resist the fascination of the too easily accepted presupposition that there was *one* primitive scheme of

the eucharistic prayer, which we could see and grasp, at least faintly, through (if not exactly in) any of the texts now extant. We must wonder first whether we have not, in the material at our disposal, a reflection of different possible models or shapes of the eucharist, having all and each of them its own consistency. It is only after having seriously considered such a possibility that we shall be able to ask the question if and how these are related between themselves, and finally to discover how the basic notions and realities which make the eucharist have evolved with them and through them.

As soon as we take this other line, it seems possible to come to a provisional agreement that all the texts we have may be sorted at first sight into five great families. Among these families, three are Eastern, two are Western. From East to West they are the liturgies of Eastern Syria, Western Syria, Egypt, Rome and what could be called the European far-West (putting under the last rubric both the Gallican and Mozarabic liturgies).

Let us just call to mind a few details very well known by all the specialists.

1. The East Syrian liturgy has survived in those parts of the Roman empire that were soon to fall under Persian rule and the intellectual centre of which was to be Edessa. In spite of various foreign influences it can be found still alive among the Nestorians, the Chaldeans in communion with Rome, and the Syro-Malabars. The most ancient document of this family is the anaphora of Adai and Mari, still in use, with some easily recognizable accretions, in all these Churches. It is becoming clearer and clearer that the liturgy of Hippolytus pertains to the same type. The detail of its formularies has very little in common with Adai and Mari, but the community of structure between the two is only the more striking for that.

2. The West Syrian liturgy is linked with the two centres of Antioch and Jerusalem, and it has become, under more or less evolved forms, the common liturgy of almost all the Orthodox Churches of to-day, and even of the Armenian Church and also of the Syro-Malankars. The most famous of its later embodiments are known under the names of saint John Chrysostom and saint Basil, these and the others having succeeded the once very widely used liturgy known as that of saint James. Saint James can be said to exhibit the classic pattern of this type, and it is very near the liturgy once so highly praised among scholars and contained in the eighth book of the so-called *Apostolic Constitutions*.

3. The Egyptian liturgy, as much as and may be more than the East Syrian, has undergone foreign influences, above all that of the West Syrian liturgy. But its former characteristics are easy to discern under these repaints, both in the Greek liturgy of saint Mark and in its more or less literal equivalent, the Coptic saint Cyril. Older documents, like the euchologion of Serapion, bishop of Thmuis, or the fragment of an anaphora known through the Der Balizeh manuscript, or the other and shorter one that has come to us in a manuscript edited by Andrieu and Collomp, clearly show the antiquity and continuity of these characteristics.

4. The Roman liturgy, as is well known, has become the prevalent one in the West. For what concerns us here, i. e. the Canon, a quotation of saint Ambrose, unfortunately shorter than we could desire it to be, makes it clear that from the end of the IVth century at least the central part of it already presented a structure and formulae very near those to which we are well accustomed.

5. Of the Gallican liturgy, we have no ordinary, which means no full text of the eucharistic prayer itself. But we have enough indications to be sure that this prayer was made on the same model as the eucharistic prayer of the Mozarabic liturgy (which should be rather called Visigothic). And as regards this last group we have, with abundant but late formulae, some explicit statements, of saint Isidore of Seville especially, which make it clear that its structure was, at his time, already the same.

Putting aside all considerations not arising from the texts themselves, it is obvious that the East Syrian type, especially when considered in formulae like Adai and Mari or that of the *Traditio apostolica*, looks very archaic. Not only is the anaphora far more condensed than elsewhere but elements found everywhere else are not there, or, if they are, it is only as a kind of embryo. Neither Adai and Mari nor Hippolytus have the sanctus. What they have in the way of an epiclesis is far less elaborate than in all the other texts. Neither of them confronts us with that admixture of the eucharistic trend with detailed intercessions in the first part of the prayer which is so conspicuous in both the Alexandrian and the Roman types, nor have they, even in the last part, more than a very general prayer for the Church, most unlike the lengthy intercessions accumulated there especially in the West Syrian type. To which might be added the quite unique feature of Adai and Mari that there is no explicit mention, in the prayer itself, of any sacrificial idea, while

this, in Hippolytus, is just introduced with the words *oblatio* and *offerre* once only. Adai and Mari, in the manuscripts we have now of it, even has no mention of the words of the institution. But we may doubt whether that is really primitive after the discussion of the problem by Dom Bernard Botte. This scholar has shown, by a comparison with the anaphora ascribed to Theodore of Mopsuestia, where these words are found, that the formula of anamnesis in Adai and Mari cannot be construed except on the supposition that these words were there also formerly, in a more or less identical phrasing to that which has been preserved in Theodore, together with the anamnesis depending on them which is still the same in both. Are we then to conclude that from the East Syrian type all the others must have proceeded, through later additions and modifications? This, in my opinion, is just the fatal mistake we should be most careful to avoid. For the presence in all the other families of all the same characteristics which are either purely absent from the East Syrian type, or only there as an embryo, together with irreducible differences between these other families, should point us to quite an other conclusion. The simultaneity of these coincidences on a series of points, where all the other liturgies than the East Syrian one differ from it, together with striking differences between themselves, points rather to a case of different developments not of the East Syrian liturgy but of another source. This other source, on the other hand, must have been related, if not to the East Syrian liturgy, at least to a source of it, since we have in both lines some common strands. But it must also have been relatively independent of it, since it included at least the root of the same developments of elements still undeveloped in the East Syrian type, and as well of what had there not even an embryo.

To verify our hypothesis, and if possible to make it more precise, let us look more closely at the four other families, i. e. the West Syrian, Egyptian, Roman and Far-Western types. In spite of what has become the usual distinction between the Eastern and Western Church, we cannot escape the fact that we meet here with both differences within each side and analogies between both sides of what could be called the iron curtain of our modern ecclesiastical imagination. Between the West Syrian and the Far-Western types analogies are soon evident and descend into such material details that they cannot mean only a parallel evolution but necessarily a common one, at least up to a certain

date. The same can be said of the Roman type when compared with the Egyptian one.

First of all the West Syrian eucharistic prayer (let alone many other liturgical peculiarities), as well as the Mozarabic formularies, manifest an order and a logical continuity which find no equivalent elsewhere. It is easy to understand how Walter Frere was so impressed by the fact that he pointed to it as the perfect embodiment of the eucharistic prayer. It is less understandable that such a fine scholar could have concluded therefrom that we meet there with the primitive shape of the eucharist. Such an order and logic seem far too conscious and deliberate for that. Especially the trinitarian scheme so conspicuous in the liturgy of saint James looks far more like an achievement of men imbued with the theology of the end of the fourth century than like a primitive feature. And we may think it strange that Frere saw only a sad example of degradation already visible in the fact that more than one of the Mozarabic prayers do not exhibit clearly that trinitarian scheme, without wondering whether they did not betray in this a more (and not less) ancient stage of evolution.

However, even setting aside the trinitarian division (between a "preface" and *sanctus* centered on the Father, an intermediary part on the Son, a conclusion on the Spirit), we should be rather inclined to see another vestige of an earlier stage of the same tradition in the Mozarabic than in the West Syrian texts. And it is the fact that, while in these last texts we have a single prayer developing continuously, as a majestic period, from beginning to end of the eucharist, in the Mozarabic we have always the succession of three distinct prayers, certainly connected by the development of some leading idea (or rather ideas), but each one rounded off: from the *illatio* (or its Gallican counterpart the *contestatio*), through the *post sanctus* to the *post pridie*. Here is archaism on the side of the Mozarabic (and as well the Gallican) tradition: Although their scheme of development (as we can see it expressly stated by saint Isidore) was very well defined, they could, until a very late date, be clothed in an indefinite variety of formulae, long after stereotyped formulae had prevailed at Antioch or Jerusalem, or other places connected with them.

In spite of these differences, let us insist on it, not only the analogy but the community of origin between the West Syrian and the Far Western types cannot be denied. A simple detail, among others, is sufficient to establish it: the way in which the

part of the prayer after the *sanctus*, in both cases, is connected with it by a rhetorical expansion of the theme of divine holiness. Therefore we can confidently say that both in West Syria and in Gaul and Spain we find the same type of eucharistic prayer, praising and thanking God for all His gifts, first by uniting us with the hymn of the seraphim in the *sanctus*, then by a rehearsal of the redemptive incarnation, to culminate in the memorial of the Last Supper and the Cross, before expanding into an invocation, both for the holy gifts themselves and for the Church going to use them, developing in the East into a wider intercession before coming back to the initial eucharistic theme in a final doxology.

If, after that, we pass to the Egyptian and Roman liturgies, the differences from the preceding type catch the eye immediately, but no less new analogies which, once more, will come down into such material details that we cannot but admit again a community of origin.

A first point could seem purely negative. No more readily in Alexandria than in Rome can we find anything of that fine order and logical progression which are so much in evidence both at Antioch or Jerusalem and at Toledo. More studies have been devoted of recent years to the Roman than to the Egyptian rites and scholars have accustomed us to a lament over some hypothetical good order of a primitive Roman liturgy which the medieval canon would have broken to pieces. If these scholars had paid as much attention to the Egyptian liturgy they could have brought their wail of lamentations up to Alexandria, and even made it a bit higher there. For the Alexandrian texts, and not only the most recent ones, but as much (if not more) the older ones, when you come to them having tasted the Antiochene first (or their Far Western analogues) give you the same impression of a complete upheaval and hopeless confusion.

First of all, there is absolutely no trace of the neat distinction and careful separation between the eucharist properly so called and intercessions, which was to be found as well in the Mozarabic as in the West Syrian texts. At Alexandria, just as in Rome, after the eucharistic introduction, the movement seems to be interrupted by a succession of petitions for all kinds of things and of people. And, at Alexandria, this happens even sooner than in Rome, since the intercessions are introduced already before the *sanctus*.

Then, in what seems to be more ancient in Egypt as well as in Rome (in texts which have not yet patently undergone a West Syrian influence) we do not find the classical (or so considered) epiclesis. Instead, we find there not one but two epicleses, apparently vaguer, the one (before and not after the words of the institution) alluding to the consecration of the holy gifts, the other one (after these same words) saying nothing of that, and neither invoking explicitly the Holy Ghost.

After that, there are verbal similitudes, here also, and even more striking than between West Syria and the Far West: 1) The eucharistic sacrifice, in both, is related to those of Abel and Abraham; 2) in both a mysterious Angel is invoked; 3) in both this happens in connection with an allusion to the heavenly altar.

Therefore, once more, we cannot doubt that we have here again a consistent type, in which the blending of the eucharist with the intercessions, on the one hand, a double epiclesis, on the other hand, of an altogether different nature from that which has been brought to perfection in West Syria, betray an autonomous scheme, which can in no way have resulted from any supposed disintegration of the West Syrian one. At this point a few words should be added concerning the eucharist of Hippolytus. That it conforms to a pattern especially archaic, most probably the same that lies behind Adai and Mari, seems indisputable. But that this pattern could have evolved so as to produce the West Syrian type seems incredible, and it is not only incredible but unthinkable that the same pattern (through or without the intermediary of the West Syrian one) could ever have led to something like the Roman Canon.

People have become hypnotized by the fact that Hippolytus dabbled for some time in the life of the Church of Rome. Therefore they have tried to explain the Roman liturgy as a derivation of his own rite, not grasping the fact that he was there as a foreigner, criticizing everything while (and because) understanding nothing, and far from being the creator of the local rite trying to substitute another for it.

The West Syrian pattern (substantially the same as the Mozarabic or Gallican ones) on the one hand, the Roman and Alexandrian pattern on the other hand, have such distinctive and mutually exclusive features that neither can depend on the other. However, the common inclusion in both of elements or

characteristics foreign to the East Syrian pattern postulates a common archetype different from that which may lie behind Adai and Mari as well as Hippolytus.

Can we after this go a step further? Can we hope to recapture something of a former stage in the evolution? Have we any means of ascertaining what the primitive pattern could have been like of which both Hippolytus and Adai and Mari are not so much different products as different clothings? And can we, in some measure at least, know what was that more elusive pattern, having some major points in common with the first one, but apparently much more complex, and such as was able to evolve as well into the Alexandrian-Roman type as also into the West Syrian and Far Western one?

In spite of all the prejudices which still prevent the majority of Christian liturgical scholars from looking there for any possible solution of their problems, I should feel inclined to think that the study of the Jewish synagogal liturgy could help us and lead us, if not exactly to what we seek, to something not very far from it.

I perfectly know what will be objected to any such suggestion. The earliest collection of the synagogal prayers available to us is the *Seder Amram Gaon*, which cannot be much anterior to the Xth century of the Christian era, nor have we any manuscript of it anterior to the late middle ages. But it may be observed that neither had we any ms. of the full Hebrew Bible older than the IXth century, until the recent discoveries, at Qumran especially. Who then could have seriously doubted on this ground the substantial genuineness of the Biblical text? It is true that we had to corroborate its earlier versions and plenty of quotations. But, if we have no ancient version of the synagogal prayers, we have lots of quotations of and commentary upon them which also are enough to make us sure at least of the substantial antiquity of a great many of them. Most of all the few that we are now to consider are, by all the competent scholars, admitted to have been substantially the same as we have them, except for a few noticeable additions, already at the time of our Lord. May we be allowed to add that, if they were not, any possibility that they evolved out of Christian prayers being of course excluded, the analogies and notional, and even verbal, coincidences we are soon to observe could not be explained?

Let us take first the great berakah for the conclusion of a meal, to be said (or rather sung) over the last cup. After an intro-

ductory dialogue, where we find our: "Let us give thanks to the Lord our God", with the response: "It is right and our bounden duty", comes a text made of the succession of three distinct berakoth. The first is a blessing of God for the gift of food, whence we come to a general praise of creation. The second, passing from the food to the holy land of which it is the fruit, expands in the same way into a praise of God's saving action in history, and more particularly in the Exodus events. The third one, more fully developed than the two preceding ones, starts from a prayer that God will once again, for those who are met there, make visible his power and mercy, into a more definite supplication that they may be all gathered into His kingdom at the coming of the Messiah. After that, the prayer turns back again to praise and thanksgiving in a final doxology.

Now, is not this line of development exactly that of either Adai and Mari or Hippolytus? The resemblance becomes still more evident when we do not take the usual Jewish text for daily meals but that for the meal on a Sabbath or a Festival. Then the third paragraph is introduced by a formal anamnesis of the divine actions, in which, in accordance with the fine analysis by Jeremias of the Jewish "memorial", the past divine intervention may be re-presented by us to God. There, as Max Thurian has shown conclusively for the eucharistic words used by Jesus, lies certainly the root of the Christian idea of the eucharistic meal being sacrificial. In the same way already, among the Jewish communities, as Josephus tells us for the Essenes, such meals had come to be considered as a better equivalent for the sacrifices of the Temple. Precisely, while, in Adai and Mari, there is yet no sacrificial formula apart from the anamnesis itself, it is there that in Hippolytus we see a first appearance of *oblatio* and *offerre*. And it can be added that in all the other oldest Christian formulae for the eucharist, it is there also that these words or their equivalent enter the scene and are organized for the first time into a systematic development, of which a most characteristic expression will be the Greek well known phrase: *τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν σοὶ προσφέροντες*.

If now we come to the great prayers not any more of the liturgy of meals but of the liturgy of the solemn public office of the synagogue, what can we see?

The first of these two prayers is there as an introduction to the central act of daily devotion of the Jewish people: i. e. to the

recitation of the Shema. It starts with a berakah again of God as creator, not this time of food and life but of light and knowledge. This leads to the saying or singing together of the sanctus (or, to give it its Jewish name: the Kedushah). After which another berakah, on the gift of the Torah that brings the Jews into the company of the Angels, expands in its turn into a praise of God as the Redeemer of His own. Hence finally the Shema: "Hear Israel, etc."

After the Shema, the synagogal meeting comes to the Tephilah, that is to say "the prayer" par excellence: the Shemone Esre, "the eighteen (blessings)", although they are now nineteen, the 12th one of to-day having been added after the fall of Jerusalem. Now the first characteristic of these so-called "blessings" is the way in which most of them pass from the blessing, that is to say the prayer of praise or thanksgiving, the eucharistic prayer as we have it, to a petition, and more precisely a detailed intercession for the whole people of God. There are first three blessings properly so called, then twelve (now thirteen) intercessions or petitions, and again three blessings. The first three glorify God for His covenant with Israel, introducing there an explicit commemoration of the saints, i. e. Abraham and the patriarchs. Then, after a blessing for the holy Name which their heirs and followers have to sanctify, come in the intercessions. We come again, in the end, to the blessing, by the way of a solemn commendation of the daily sacrifices of Israel, which the rabbis thought to have been a mere borrowing of an old formula used in the Temple for a commendation of the actual sacrifice itself. If we compare these two prayers with the eucharistic prayer of the Alexandrian-Roman type, without the coincidence being always so immediate as between the Jewish blessing after meals and the East Syrian eucharist, there is again a general parallelism between the developments of both liturgies, the Jewish and the Christian, which is again very impressive. Our preface corresponds to the berakah for light and knowledge almost as much as our sanctus to the following Kedushah. The blessing for the Torah and the love of God revealed to us in it, followed by the first blessings of the Shemone Esre, with their commemoration of the covenant and of the saints, leading to a prayer for the whole people of God of to-day, and finally a commendation of their sacrifices, is not indeed in such verbal agreement with the next part of the Alexandrian anaphora or the Roman canon;

nonetheless there is again a striking analogy between the two chains of prayers and the succession of their themes.

After that, the end of the Roman or Egyptian eucharist comes very near the development of the East Syrian formulae, and, in so far, of the prayer after meals in the Jewish liturgy.

What are we to conclude? I should suggest that these considerations should lead to the conclusion that the East Syrian type of the Christian eucharist has evolved from the prayer after meals at a very early date, when the Church had not yet been cut from the synagogue so that, as Gregory Dix had it, the eucharist was still a private service of the Christians held, at home, after having taken part in the public service of the synagogue together with the Jews.

At a later date, when the Christians had been expelled from the synagogues, they had to provide for some equivalent of the synagogal service of readings and prayers. Then they produced new prayers of their own, evolving now from a combination of the prayers of the synagogal service with those of the meals. Hence the shape of the Roman and Alexandrian eucharist, following the main line of a synagogal service, now passed without a break to the meal. It seems that even the major difference between the Egyptian and the Roman orders, i. e. the different place where the intercessory prayers enter, either before or after the sanctus, may find an easy explanation in the Jewish origin of our Christian texts. For, at an early date, the Shemone Esre had come to be recited twice: once silently, first, by everybody, then in a loud voice, formerly by the president of the community (now by the minister). However, with the second recitation, immediately after the second blessing, the Kedushah was to be said for a second time. That means that both ways could be considered as equally traditional, of having the intercession before or after the sanctus. This last hypothesis may find some confirmation in the fact that the form of the Kedushah which was finally to prevail in Christian use is not just that which followed the berakah for light and knowledge, with its exact quotation of Isaiah: "*The earth* is full of His glory", but a slightly different one which comes from a targum of the text used after the first recitation of the Shemone Esre: "*Heaven and earth* are full of His glory".

What then of the West Syrian and Gallican or Mozarabic pattern? I would suggest it must have arisen as a deliberate

attempt to reduce to unity a series of doublets which could not escape attention for long. For it is to be noticed that we have, in the Jewish prayer for the meals, approximately the same sequence of the same main themes as in the prayers of the synagogal service: the first two of the three berakoth at the end of a meal are a berakah for creation followed by a berakah for the manifestation of God in history. The same stands true of the berakah for light, followed by the berakah for the Torah (before and after the Kedushah). On the other hand, the Shemone Esre, only in a fuller and more detailed way, just as the third berakah for the meal, starts from an anamnesis of the covenant and develops into a prayer for its fulfilment in us, to turn again to praise in a final doxology. Therefore, to pondering minds, and especially among those imbued with the Greek ideal of what has been called "Kunstprosa", as could be found in Antioch more perhaps than anywhere else, it might appear as a desirable improvement, while keeping all the threads of what had become the traditional eucharist, to remodel it in such a way as to avoid useless repetitions. Hence a well organized prayer where all the intercessions and petitions are put together in a logical order, and more especially where 1. the prayer for the consecration of the sacrifice, formerly evolved from the last but two of the berakoth of the Shemone Esre, and 2. the prayer for the sanctification of the faithful through the celebration should be fused together, after the full development of praise and thanksgiving to God as creator and redeemer.

It may be supposed that that organized scheme was brought from East Syria to Gaul and Spain before it had acquired its full maturity in its motherland. This was prepared for by the kind of systematic summary of all the possible themes to be combined in an ideal eucharistic prayer which we find in the VIIIth book of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, and was to take shape permanently in the prayer which we know as that of saint James and its derivatives.

In the space of a short lecture it has not been possible to do more than to hint at the details in the structure of the prayers which may support the hypothesis I submit to the criticism of scholars. But I think it is only the semantic study of the key words of the eucharistic prayer which might ultimately verify or disprove it. As an example of this study I have just touched upon the question of anamnesis and sacrifice along the lines opened

by Jeremias. May I conclude with a striking fact concerning the dependence of the Christian on the Jewish prayer at this point? In nearly all the Christian liturgies, but especially in the West Syrian ones, which however I suppose to be the most hellenized of all, it is remarkable that, in the prayers for the faithful inside the eucharist, "We offer for" and "Remember" are taken as synonymous. Nothing could be more Jewish than this unquestioned assumption.

**Licentius, *Carmen ad Augustinum* ll. 45 seqq.,
and the Easter Vigil**

AMY KEY CLARKE, Cambridge

It may sometimes happen, especially when an author engages the attention of relatively few readers, that a brilliant conjecture or interpretation may be approved too quickly on its merits, without sufficient consideration of the claims of the original text, or the justice of the interpretation in relation to the passage as a whole. An example of this may be found, I think, in ll. 45–46 of the poem addressed by Licentius to St. Augustine, his relative, teacher, and close friend, and transmitted to us by its inclusion with Letter XXVI of Augustine.

The passage which I should like to consider is ll. 45–51, with especial reference to the first two and a half lines. Licentius has just been exhorting Augustine to continue on his upward road, seeking fresh heights of wisdom and following where Christ is leading him on. He then proceeds:

*et cum luciferos praecordia vesper in ortus
distulerit, sanctumque super benedixeris ignem,
sis memor ipse mei. bibulum qui ponitis aurem
legibus invictis, contundite pectora palmis,
sternite membra solo meritosque ciete dolores
et prohibete nefas. deus imperat omnibus unum,
admonet antistes venturaque fulmina¹ terrent.*

In l. 45 three of the four MSS on which the text of this poem depends – R K P – have *praecordia*: the fourth, the tenth century M (Monacensis) has *praecorda*. The most natural explanation of this is a slip of the pen, from which mediaeval scribes were not exempt. All editors have taken *praecordia* to be the word which the MSS, rightly or wrongly, give us, and I think that they are justified in doing so.

¹ *fulmina* RP, *flumina* MK.

praecordia vesper . . . distulerit is admittedly difficult and *praecordia* came early under criticism. In the seventeenth of his sixty books *Adversariorum Commentariorum* (1624) Caspar Barth devoted Chapter 18 to Licentius' poem. He makes some good points, notably the emendation of *habet* to *hebet* in l. 2; and his suggestion of *flamina* in l. 51, as the breath of the Holy Spirit, was perceptive even if unnecessary. Of *praecordia* he says "nutrit errorem insipidum" and dismisses it with a lordly imperative, "Emacula". But his emendation, *precis orgia*, besides being an arbitrary re-writing of the text, has nothing to recommend it. It was based partly on his misunderstanding of the whole passage, which he regarded as simply an appeal by Licentius for Augustine's personal intercession "from dawn till dusk, ab aurora ad vesperuginem".

Wernsdorf, who edited Licentius in *Poetae Latini Minores* (Vol. IV, Part II) in 1785, discussed these lines in his second Excursus on the poem. He rejected Barth's emendation, — "sed abeat Barthius cum suis orgiis", — and suggested *praeconia*. This he interpreted as the *προσφάνησις* of the deacon, the regular invocation of the people to prayer, on the ground that thedeacons were called *κήρυκες* (or *ἱεροκήρυκες*) which would be *praecones* in Latin. He cannot quote any instance of *praeconium* so used, but the general usage of the word would not exclude it; Juvencus I 420, *praeconia salutis*, shows a use which might develop in this specialised way. Of the passage as a whole he had a clearer understanding than Barth: he realised that it referred to the service of vespers, that catechumens were present and that the imperatives *contundite*, *sternite* are addressed to them; and he recognised the reference to an approaching baptism, whether *fulmina*, *flumina*, or even Barth's *flamina*, were read in l. 51. He entirely failed, however, to understand *sanctum . . . ignem* and interpreted it metaphorically of the fire of devotion in the candidates' hearts.

Wernsdorf was an acute and sympathetic reader of the poem and he added considerably to our understanding of Licentius. It is not surprising that his interesting emendation held the field. His text and commentary were reprinted by Lemaire in Vol. CXXXVI of the *Bibliotheca Classica Latina* (1824), and *praeconia* thus appeared a second time. Baehrens retained it in the Teubner critical edition of the poem which appeared in 1886, and it was accepted, although with a change in interpretation, by Max Zelzner in his excellent Dissertation (Arnsberg 1915). The

only dissident that I can find to this chorus of approval is Goldbacher, who edited the poem in 1889 in the *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, (Vol. XXXIV, Section II, Part I, pp. 89–95). He resisted the lure of *praeconia* and printed the manuscript reading.

I was at first much attracted by *praeconia*, though I wished to translate it as “praises” without any specific reference: but I came gradually to the conclusion that *praecordia . . . distulerit* gave an acceptable meaning in relation to the whole passage and context; that, if this was so, the consensus of the MSS deserved much consideration; and that there was no sufficient justification for any change. It is the force of *praecordia distulerit* which I should now like to consider.

It seemed clear to me when I first read the poem that ll. 45–51 referred to the Easter Vigil and that in *sanctum benedixeris ignem* there was an allusion to the blessing of the new fire. I found that Zelzner in his Dissertation had reached the same conclusion, which was mentioned by Levy in his article in Pauly-Wissowa (Vol. XIII 206, 30). Few readers today would fail, I think, to recognize the allusion which the older editors so completely missed. “Cur ignis hic sanctus vocetur?” asks Wernsdorf pathetically, “et quae esset haec benedictio lychnorum?” Once the occasion is recognized, the following references to the coming baptism and the bishop’s sermon to the candidates, — *admonet antistes* — are then completely in place, and the case is strengthened for the date of the poem at the end of 394 or the beginning of 395. Licentius is complimenting Augustine on the invitation to be co-episcopus of Hippo. (Discussion of the objections to this dating raised by Birt and Manitius lie outside the scope of this paper; but I think that they can be completely answered, though not quite as Zelzner has answered them.)

I am so far in complete agreement with Zelzner’s interpretation of these lines. But his explanation of *praeconia*, however tempting, is difficult to accept. He takes it to be the *praeconium paschale*, the *Exultet*, and translates *distulerit* as “spread abroad on all sides”; *in luciferos ortus* he takes as the sunrise, — “orientem”. For *differre praeconium* he has the support of a passage from Apuleius, *Met.* 5, 10, *nendum ut genitoribus et omnibus populis tam beatum eius differamus praeconium*.

This is at first sight a very strong case. Against it there are the following points: 1. that *luciferos ortus* must, in this context,

refer to the Resurrection, and the meaning "spread abroad" then becomes less defensible; 2. that *differre* in this sense is not ordinarily (if at all) followed by *in*, but is frequently followed by *in* when it means "defer"; 3. that it seems very strange to mention the *Exultet* before the blessing of the new fire.

Apart from special interpretations, there is, to my mind, a further point against *praeconia*. However explained here, the word is not uncommon, and it is difficult to see why it should have been altered in all the MSS, to *praecordia*, which is, superficially, so much more difficult.

To move on to more positive ground; – if *praeconia* is suspect, what is the meaning of *praecordia vesper . . . distulerit*?

Praecordia in itself causes no difficulty; its use for the heart's fervent emotions is well-established in Latin: but the force of *distulerit* is not immediately clear. It is important to remember that we must expect a strained and difficult use of vocabulary in Licentius. He was, like his contemporary, Claudian, a genuine poet, writing at the height of the fourth-century classical revival and seeking for new forms of expression through his rich but restricted traditional medium. The usage of Claudian may be expected to throw light on the poetry of Licentius, and often does so. They were not only exact contemporaries but were – in all probability – acquainted with each other's work. It is well-known that passages in Licentius' poem bear a distinct relation to the poem of Claudian which was composed at the same date, – the *Panegyric* on the consuls Probinus and Olybrius, – and also to the opening passage of Book I of the poem *De Raptu Proserpinæ*; this book was almost certainly composed at the same time or a little earlier. This is usually regarded as an indication of Licentius' knowledge of Claudian's writings, but the influence may very well have been reciprocal. There is, I believe, considerable ground for thinking that Claudian had spent some years in Italy before 395, and that a part, at any rate, of that period had been spent at Milan, where he would have moved in the same literary circle as Licentius. A number of small indications point to this and add up. I think, to something near a probability.

It is worth while, therefore, to notice that when Claudian uses *differre*, he uses it regularly in the sense of "delay", "defer", "postpone"; I have found seven examples in this sense and so far none in any other¹. It is certainly his prevailing usage. I think

that this is the sense in which Licentius uses it here. He writes "When the Easter Eve delays our hearts' longings till the Resurrection Dawn" (*luciferos ortus*), — that is, "keeps our hearts ardently waiting for Easter Day"; and the long night's vigil that lay ahead of the worshippers is appropriately suggested by the word "defer".

There is another passage in Claudian which, I suspect, may throw light on *praecordia differre*. In the *Panegyric* for the consuls Probinus and Olybrius (who took office in January 395) he writes (ll. 65–66)

*non anxia mentem
spes agit et longo tendit praecordia voto.*

Here we see *praecordia* used in a similar type of expression. In Claudian, hope extends the heart's desire over a long period; in Licentius, the Vigil keeps desire lingering out over a long period until the time of fulfilment has come. These two passages must have been written within a few months of each other. Do they not show us the two poets, in their different ways, seeking to find new expression for the idea of hope and yearning?

¹ *In Ruf.* I 320, *In Eutrop.* II 234–235, 598, *De Tert. Cons. Hon.* 109, *De Cons. Stil.* II 316–317, 454, III 223–224.

Les *Libelli Sacramentorum* de Saint Grégoire le Grand et le Sacramentaire publié sous son nom

C. COEBERGH O. S. B., Oosterhout

Malgré l'exposé récent de Klaus Gamber¹, où celui-ci cherche à maintenir sans plus la sentence traditionnelle à propos du rôle de saint Grégoire le Grand comme auteur d'un sacramentaire, il me semble utile de revenir un instant à cette question importante. Les articles de H. Ashworth² ont contribué à mon humble avis à éclaircir quelques détails obscurs jusqu'à ce moment; mais Gamber, tout en tâchant de réfuter les arguments d'Ashworth, n'est pas arrivé à me convaincre.

Voici les raisons pourquoi. Gamber reconnaît qu'Ashworth a bien raison de faire observer que le témoignage d'Aldhelm († 709) ne se rapporte aucunement à la composition d'un sacramentaire par saint-Gregoire, puisqu'il ne mentionne que le texte du Canon de la Messe, à savoir un détail concernant le *nobis quoque*. Gamber concède aussi que ce n'est pas à tort qu'Ashworth n'admet pas que le Pape aurait fait présent de son sacramentaire à saint Augustin, l'apôtre bien connu des Anglo-saxons. Ceci, malgré l'appel d'Egbert de York († 766) à pareil sacramentaire, à propos du jeûne des Quatre-temps du printemps.

Il me semble que l'argumentation de Gamber n'est pas assez nuancée. Voici d'abord le résumé des trois arguments allégués

¹ Hat Gregor der Große ein Sakramentar verfaßt?, *Ephemerides liturgicae* (= EL) 73, 1959, 139–140.

² Gregorian elements in the Gelasian Sacramentary, EL 67, 1953, 9–23; idem: The influence of the Lombard Invasions on the Gregorian Sacramentary, *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, Vol. 36, No. 2, March, 1954, 305–327; idem: Did St. Gregory the Great compose a Sacramentary?, dans *Studia Patristica*, Vol. II (TU 64), Berlin 1957, pp. 3–16; idem: Gregorian elements in some early Gallican Service Books, *Traditio* 13, 1957, 431–443; idem: Did St. Augustine bring the Gregorianum to England?, EL 72, 1958, 39–43; idem: The liturgical prayers of St. Gregory the Great, *Traditio* 15, 1959, 107–161.

par ce travailleur méritoire. Le fait de la composition d'un sacramentaire par saint Grégoire résulterait :

- 1°. de la tradition unanime.
- 2°. de la mention du nom de saint Grégoire dans la rédaction de l'*Hadrianum*.
- 3°. de l'utilisation précoce de ce livre liturgique dans les sacramentaires mixtes.

Suivons pas-à-pas l'exposé de Gamber. «Ainsi», dit-il «dans le sacramentaire palimpseste du Mont-Cassin, écrit aux environs de l'année 700, le sacramentaire grégorien s'est déjà presque complètement fusionné avec un missel d'un type plus ancien».

Je fais remarquer d'abord que le prototype du sacramentaire grégorien ne devient saisissable qu'à partir du pontificat d'Honorius (625–638). Or l'influence d'un document datant de cette époque sur un missel des environs de l'année 700 ne semble pas être une chose bien extraordinaire!

Ensuite je fais observer que, malgré le mérite et l'autorité des paléographes, il faut être extrêmement prudent lorsqu'on veut attribuer une date précise à tel manuscrit. Je prends comme exemple le fameux homiliaire d'Agimond, prêtre de l'église des saints Philippe-et-Jacques à Rome. Agimond était d'origine lombarde, comme son nom l'indique. Dom Ashworth a eu l'obligeance de me communiquer la description de E. A. Lowe, qui ne donne aucune date plus précise que le huitième siècle. Il en est de même quant au jugement de L. Traube. Ce dernier nous dit : «Als Dokumente stadtrömischer Schreibkunst betrachtet, gehören Vatic. lat. 3835 und 3836 (à savoir l'homiliaire d'Agimond) mit folgenden beiden Unzial-Hss. zusammen: Vatic. Palat. lat. 277 aus dem achten Jahrhundert und Vatic. gr. 1666 vom Jahr 800. Mit diesen vier Vatikanischen Hss. ist überhaupt das erschöpft, was an so alten Schreiberzeugnissen für Rom mit einigem Recht in Anspruch genommen werden kann». On constate donc une marge d'un siècle entier à propos de ces manuscrits très anciens; le dernier ne peut dater que de l'année 800. Il ne paraît donc pas que l'on puisse dater très exactement le fameux homiliaire d'Agimond; la marge restera très large et pourra s'étendre par exemple du pontificat de Grégoire III (731–741) jusqu'à celui de Zacharie (741–752). Et l'on peut se demander si, malgré tout, il ne faudra pas également rabaisser la date du fameux palimpseste du Mont-Cassin 271. Mais ceci n'est

pas très important pour notre problème actuel. Comme je l'ai fait observer tout à l'heure, un sacramentaire «grégorien» du temps d'Honorius (625–638) et même un document pareil des environs des années 680–690 a pu être utilisé pour la composition d'un missel de l'année 700. Qu'est ce que s'y opposerait?

Gamber argumente ensuite, que toute l'histoire des sacramentaires resterait incompréhensible, si l'on nierait la composition d'un sacramentaire par Grégoire. Ici l'argumentation de l'illustre liturgiste ne me semble pas suffisamment nuancée. En effet, il faudra distinguer, à mon humble avis, sous quelle forme on a considéré tel pape comme auteur d'une réforme liturgique, ou bien d'un sacramentaire ou d'un antiphonaire. S. J. P. Van Dijk nous a montré dans son article: *The Urban and Papal Rites in Seventh and Eighth-Century Rome*¹ qu'Andrieu avait tort de méconnaître la valeur du témoignage de l'*Ordo XIX*. Cet *Ordo* présente une liste de papes et de trois abbés inconnus d'un monastère auprès de Saint-Pierre du Vatican. Au numéro 36 de l'*Ordo XIX*, dans l'édition de M. Andrieu, *Les Ordines Romani du Haut Moyen Age*, III Les Textes (Suite) (*Ordines XIV–XXXIV*) pp. 223–224 on trouve cette énumération, et on peut facilement constater qu'à moins d'avoir utilisé d'autres sources inconnus, authentiques ou non – l'auteur de cet *Ordo* a pour le moins développé d'après sa propre fantaisie ou celle des moines des monastères romains, ses amis, des indications du *Liber Pontificalis*, que je cite d'après l'édition L. Duchesne.

Ordo XIX, 36

Id s(unt): primus beatus Damasus papa, adiovante (!) sancto Hieronimo presbitero, vel ordinem aecclesiasticum di- scriptum (!) de Hierusolema permisso (!) sancto ipsius Damasi trans- mittentem instituit et ordinavit.

Post hunc beatissimus Leo papa annalem cantum omnem insti- tuit et ordinavit.

Liber Pontificalis

Hic constituit ut psalmos die noctuque canerentur per omnes ecclesias; qui hoc praecepit presbiteris vel epis- copis aut monasteriis.

Notice sur Damase:
XXXVIII.

DAMASUS (366–384), p. 213.
Hic constituit ut intra actionem sacrificii diceretur sanctum sacrificium et cetera.

¹ *Sacris Erudiri* 12, 1961, 456.

Ici l'indication du *Liber Pontificalis* est bien mince, mais l'auteur de l'*Ordre XIX* savait peut-être que saint Léon est l'auteur de bien des oraisons ou préfaces de la messe; on en trouve aussi bien dans le *Sacramentarium Veronense* (= le soi-disant «léonien»), que dans les pseudo-gélatiens (Vat. Reg. 316 et gélatiens sous la forme mixte, Gellonense, Paris B. N. 12048 et ses congénères) ou les grégoriens de Padoue et d'Hadrien¹. Il y avait peut-être aussi une tradition concernant p. ex. la série des antennes *O admirabile commercium* (voir: M. Herz, *Commercium. Eine begriffsgeschichtliche Studie zur Theologie der Römischen Liturgiesprache*, München 1958, p. 66 ss. et 104) qui auraient peut-être saint Léon comme auteur. De son côté Dom L. Brou a fait remarquer dans son article: *Saint Grégoire de Nazianze et l'antienne «Mirabile mysterium»*² un passage du sermon VII de saint Léon le Grand, que fait lire le bréviaire romain à la 6^e leçon du jour, et dans lequel C. Marbach (*Carmina scripturarum*, Appendice p. 542) voyait la source de l'antienne *Mirabile mysterium*. Ces passages sont ainsi conçus: *Verbum igitur Dei . . . factus est homo . . . ut manens quod erat, assumensque quod non erat . . .* (S. 96; PL 54, 467 A); *In utraque natura idem est Dei Filius nostra suscipiens et propria non amittens*. La fameuse antienne du *Benedictus* des Laudes de la fête de la Circoncision³ se présente ainsi: *Mirabile mysterium declaratur hodie, innovantur naturae, Deus homo factus est: id quod fuit permansit, et quod non erat assumpsit; non commixtionem passus neque divisionem*, et il n'est aucunement étonnant que les chantres romains du VII^e et du VIII^e siècle étaient frappés par de pareilles similitudes. De

¹ A. P. Lang, *Leo der Große und die Texte des Altgelasianums, mit Berücksichtigung des Sacramentarium Leonianum und des Sacramentarium Gregorianum*, Steyl 1957; idem: *Anklänge an liturgische Texte in Epiphaniensermonen Leos des Großen*, Sacris Erudiri (= SE) 10, 1958, 43–126; idem: *Leo der Große und die liturgischen Texte des Oktavtages von Epiphanie*, SE 11, 1960, 12–135; idem: *Anklänge an Orationen der Ostervigil in Sermonen Leos des Großen*, SE 13, 1962, 281–325; C. Mohlberg, *Nuove considerazioni sul cosi detto Sacramentarium Leonianum*, EL 47, 1933, 3–12.

² EL 58, 1944, 20.

³ La fête de la Circoncision comme telle n'est pas d'origine romaine. Il y avait à Rome, dès le septième siècle, une station solennelle, le 1^{er} janvier, à la basilique de Sainte-Marie *ad Martyres*. La désignation officielle de la fête, c'est *Octavas Domini* (H. Lietzmann, *Das Sacramentarium Gregorianum*, Münster in Westf. 1921, numéro 14). C'est une sorte de renouvellement de la solennité de Noël, avec une préoccupation spéciale de la Vierge-Mère; voir: L. Duchesne, *Origines du culte chrétien* (Paris 1925) p. 290.

tels rapprochements ont pu faire considérer le grand Pape lui-même comme l'auteur de cette antienne et de celles rapportées par M. Herz, l. c.

<i>Ordo XIX, 36 (suite)</i>	<i>Liber Pontificalis</i>
<i>Deinde beatus Zelasius papa similiter omnem annalem cantum seu et decretalia . . . conscripsit.</i>	<i>Gelasius, natione Afer . . . Hic . . . fecit et (h)yminos in modum b. Ambrosii; item . . . fecit . . . sacramentorum praefationes et orationes canto sermone . . .</i>

Cette notice pouvait suffire à l'auteur de l'*Ordo XIX* pour attribuer à Zelasius (lisez: *Gelasius*) un rôle important et très actif dans l'organisation de l'office divin¹. On l'a de même, bien à tort, mais jusqu'en nos jours, considéré comme l'auteur d'un sacramentaire², malgré la teneur exacte du texte du *Liber Pontificalis*, qui ne mentionne pas un ouvrage c'est à dire un sacramentaire complet, mais seulement: *sacramentorum praefationes et orationes* (l. c. p. 255 dans la 2^e édition, la fin du VI^e siècle; l'*Abrégé Félicien* ne mentionne que: «*sacramentorum praefationes*» (l. c. p. 94).

<i>Ordo XIX, 36 (suite)</i>	<i>Liber Pontificalis</i>
<i>Post hunc Simachus papa similiter et ipse annalem suum cantum ededit.</i>	<i>Symmachus, natione Sardus . . . Hic constituit ut omne die dominicum vel natali-</i>

¹ Rappelons le texte instructif de Gélase Ier, *Epistula 14*, cap. 15 (A. Thiel, *Epistulae romanorum pontificum*. Vol. 1, (Braunsberg 1868, 371; Migne, PL 59, col. 55: *Ad episcopos Lucaniae*): «Consequens fuit ut illa quoque quae de Picenis partibus ad nos missa relatio nuntiavit . . . id est, plurimos clericorum negotiationibus in honestis et lucris turbibus imminere . . . Psalmistam quoque David surda dissimulantes aure cantantem: Quoniam non cognovi negotiationes, introibo in potentias Domini (Ps. 70, 15–16)». Gélase suppose donc que ces paroles, noyées quelque part dans le psautier et jamais utilisées ailleurs dans l'office divin, devaient être assez familières aux clercs susdits. Il faut en conclure que la récitation du psautier tout entier était obligatoire pour eux, du moins en principe. Autrement le reproche de Gélase devient incompréhensible. Admettons donc pour le moins un roulement de tous les psaumes, sans conclure tout de suite à l'usage de la récitation du psautier hebdomadaire par le clergé séculier, qui ne semble avoir été introduite que sous l'influence de coutumes monastiques. Voir aussi l'étude de O. Heiming, *Zum monastischen Offizium von Kassianus bis Kolumbanus* (*Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* VII. 1 (1962) 89–156).

² J. Janini, *El Gelasiano «De Missarum solemnis»*, *Hispania Sacra* 11, 1958, 1–23.

cia martyrum Gloria in excelsis (h)ymnus diceretur.

Ici la base de la notice du *Liber Pontificalis* semble bien étroite. Néanmoins le zèle de Symmaque pour la splendeur du culte se manifeste dans le texte du *Liber*, qui mentionne expressément tous les dimanches et les nombreuses fêtes de martyrs à Rome. Quoi de plus naturel que la conclusion de l'auteur de l'*Ordo* que Symmaque lui aussi se soit occupé des textes liturgiques à chanter en ces occasions, quoique le *Liber* ne fait mention que de l'introduction du *Gloria in excelsis* aux messes des dimanches et des fêtes susdits. Il croyait sans doute savoir lire entre les lignes, et si l'on veut l'interpréter à son tour, il n'y a qu'à respecter tout simplement sa tournure d'esprit. Concluons donc que les érudits du haut moyen-âge cherchaient à exploiter même les moindres indices de leurs sources. Ils n'inventaient pas de toutes pièces leurs assertions, mais ils interprétaient à leur propre façon les renseignements qu'ils avaient à leur disposition. Il n'est pas besoin d'insister sauf pour ce qui regarde le cas du pape Grégoire le Grand lui-même. Ici l'*Ordo XIX*, 36, malgré le verbiage de son auteur, ne nous apprend que peu de chose; en guise de conclusion il ne dit que: «*et cantum anni circoli nobili (!) ededit.*» Il y a un exemple plus intéressant; c'est la manière dont au neuvième siècle Jean diacre, le fameux biographe de saint Grégoire, s'avisa d'interpréter l'activité liturgique de son héros. Il met à profit aussi bien le *Registrum* des lettres de Grégoire que les autres écrits de celui-ci, qu'il paraît connaître à fond. Par ailleurs il ne néglige pas non plus la *Vita* succincte du *Liber Pontificalis*. Mon ami J. Janini a attiré mon attention sur le rapprochement qu'on peut faire entre la lettre dédicatoire des *Moralia in Job*, adressée à l'évêque de Séville, Léandre, et le récit de Jean diacre à propos du sacramentaire grégorien dans sa *Vita S. Gregorii*, II, 17. Que l'on me permette de juxtaposer ces deux textes et d'en tirer quelques conclusions.

S. Gregorius M. (591–604)
Moralium libri. Epistola missoria Leandro episcopo. PL 75,
 512 C.

*Cumque mihi spatia largiora
 suppeterent
 multa augens*

Joannes Diaconus (872–882)
Vita S. Gregorii II, 17 PL
 75, 94

*Sed et gelasianum codicem
 de missarum sollemniis
 multa substrahens*

<i>pauca substrahens</i>	<i>pauca convertens</i>
<i>atque ita ut inventa sunt</i>	<i>nonnulla SUPERADI-</i>
<i>nonnulla derelinquens . . .</i>	<i>CIENS, pro exponendis evan-</i>
	<i>gelicis lectionibus</i>
	<i>in unius libri volumine</i>
	<i>coarctavit</i>

Il semble donc que Jean diacre a connu un «gélasien» en 3 ou 2 livres; les «gélausiens» sous leur forme ancienne (en 3 livres) aussi bien que sous leur forme plus récente (fusion du gélasien ancien et du grégorien) étaient courants au neuvième siècle. On s'est demandé ce que pouvait signifier le: *pro evangelicis lectionibus exponendis* dans le texte de Jean. Ces mots semblent ici hors de propos et bien mystérieux¹. Mais il n'en est rien. En y regardant de près on comprend que Jean a voulu tout simplement accentuer le rôle bien connu, mais rare à son époque, de son héros comme prédicateur. Or, il était d'usage que le sermon devait avoir lieu pendant la messe, après la lecture de l'évangile du jour. Il en résulte que Jean diacre pouvait écrire tout naturellement que saint Grégoire a composé un sacramentaire en rapport avec son activité comme prédicateur. Mais Jean savait qu'on attribuait de son temps (en se basant sur le témoignage du *Liber Pontificalis*) le sacramentaire «romain» (quoique mêlé de matières transalpines) sous sa forme plus longue à saint Gélase. D'autre part il y avait la mention du nom de saint Grégoire comme auteur dans la rédaction de l'*Hadrianum*. Jean ne s'est même pas donné la peine de nous renseigner sur le contenu exact du sacramentaire de son église de la Haute Italie. Il n'a fait qu'appliquer sans plus son jeu littéraire, en jouant un tour à ses lecteurs. En effet, il connaissait très bien l'œuvre du grand Grégoire. Celui-ci aurait donc appliqué à peu près le même procédé littéraire en composant son sacramentaire, tout comme il l'avait fait en composant et en corrigéant son texte des *Moralia*! Jean ne prétend nullement à

¹ A. Baumstark, Untersuchungen, 17*-18*: „Diskreditiert wird jene Angabe dabei noch insbesondere durch die völlig unverständliche Verbindung, in welche offenbar auch die angebliche Sakramentarbearbeitung mit den Evangelienhomilien gebracht werden will; wobei anscheinend irgendwie die Übereinstimmung der Stationsangaben ihrer Überschriften mit denjenigen des Gregorianum eine Rolle gespielt haben muß.“ (Voir: Die älteste erreichbare Gestalt des *Liber Sacramentorum anni circuli* der römischen Kirche [Cod. Pad. D 47, fol. 11*-100*] Einleitung und Textausgabe von K. Mohlberg. Untersuchungen von A. Baumstark. Münster in Westf. 1927).

faire de la critique purement historique; il n'a qu'un besoin: celui d'écrire une biographie savoureuse de son héros et d'édifier ses contemporains, à savoir ses lecteurs. Cette observation suffit à montrer à quelle espèce appartient la mentalité de la plupart de ces historiens du haut moyen-âge. Il ne faudra donc pas tout nier a priori, mais non plus les prendre trop à la lettre. Il faudra à son tour savoir lire entre les lignes.

J'ai lu autrefois quelque part que certains attribuaient sans plus le sacramentaire à saint Grégoire, mais d'autres au pape Honorius (625–638). Ce jugement n'a cessé que de m'intriguer, quoique je n'en retrouve plus la source. Depuis les travaux de B. Capelle¹ et de H. Ashworth on peut reconnaître sans difficulté la main de saint Grégoire dans plusieurs oraisons du Grégorien et même du «Gélasien ancien». Mais telle quelle ce n'est qu'une preuve de l'usage qu'on a fait de l'œuvre littéraire de Grégoire dans la compilation du sacramentaire grégorien en particulier, car ces oraisons sont sans conteste de la main de Grégoire. Or c'est bien autre chose que de conclure précipitamment de la partie au tout! Il s'agit d'un véritable problème; ici la solution ne dépend pas même de l'accord du placement de certains dimanches mêlés au sanctoral. Admettons un instant que la solution de Klaus Gamber soit valable; Grégoire aurait alors composé son sacramentaire complet en l'année 592 déjà. La date de Pâques était alors le 6 avril; la lettre dominicale étant e. Eh bien, nous retrouvons exactement la même date de Pâques en l'année 629 par exemple, donc pendant une des premières années du pontificat d'Honorius, qui pourrait aussi bien, sinon plus sûrement, être l'auteur du sacramentaire complet. On nous affirme que l'oratoire de Saint-André près du Latran² a été dédié par Honorius; c'est un des lieux de station des vêpres pascales dans le «grégorien», lequel mentionne aussi la dédicace de l'ancien Panthéon (H = Hadrianum) H 107, accomplie par Boniface IV (608–615), Saint-Nicomède, église consacrée par Boniface V (619–625). Les églises de Saint-Apollinaire, de Sainte-Lucie la Romaine, et de Saint Adrien, mentionnées comme lieux de station, datent du temps d'Honorius, celle de Saint-Georges de Léon II (682–683). Celle de Saint-Théodore (H 175) semble

¹ B. Capelle, *La main de S. Grégoire dans le sacramentaire Grégorien*, *Revue bénédictine* 49, 1937, 13–28. H. Ashworth, voir plus haut, p. 176, n. 2.

² L. Duchesne, *Origines du culte chrétien*, Paris 1925, p. 131.

postérieure à Honorius, et date peut-être du pape homonyme (642–649). L'*Hadrianum*, qui semble représenter la forme la plus authentique du sacramentaire grégorien nous fait descendre jusqu'à l'époque de Sergius (687–701) en raison des 4 fêtes mariales, et de la translation du corps de saint Léon en 688. Enfin l'introduction des jeudis de Carême, dont la station est marquée, date de Grégoire II (715–731). Il semble probable que du moins les pontificats d'Honorius († 638) et de Grégoire II († 731) marquent des points de repère de la première et de la dernière édition du grégorien complet avant l'*Hadrianum*, qui paraît s'identifier avec cette dernière. Il faut intercaler peut-être une édition sous Serge I^{er} († 701).

En tout cas, un problème historique et littéraire ne se résout pas par un seul jeu de calcul, comme le semble vouloir K. Gamber. Sa date pascale du 6 avril se retrouve par exemple encore sous Vitalien (657–672) dont S. P. J. Van Dijk¹ nous a montré récemment le rôle important au point de vue des pratiques liturgiques à Rome, c'est à dire en 665. Il n'en résulte donc rien de très sûr ou de bien défini²!

Il y a un autre argument qui semble plaider contre un prototype bien défini de la main de Grégoire, à savoir le soin extrême

¹ The Urban and Papal Rites in Seventh and Eighth-Century Rome SE 12, 1961, 411–487, en particulier pp. 465–467.

² Je crois du reste avoir démontré que l'on ne peut pas s'attendre à une série ininterrompue de messes dominicales *per annum* dans un sacramentaire strictement papal, en raison des ordinations épiscopales, relativement fréquentes, que le pape accomplissait le jour du dimanche. Je peux ajouter ici quelques anciens exemples d'ordinations épiscopales au jour du dimanche par les papes. Dans la chronique de l'église de Ravenne par Agnellus (Agnelli qui et Andreas, *Liber Pontificalis Ecclesiae Ravennatis*, éd. O. Holder-Egger, (Monumenta Germaniae Historica (= MGH) Scriptores rerum Langobardicarum et Italicarum saec. VI–IX, Hannoverae 1878, on trouve au numéro 93 (p. 337): *DE SANCTO PETRO SENIORI XXVIII*. Puis à la ligne 7: *Iste secunda inductione consecratus est Romae absque ieiunio 17. Kal. Octubris, et reversus in pace, cum nimia alacritate cives Ravennates eum suscepérunt . . .* (Dans la note 5, p. 337 Holder-Egger ajoute: «Dies vero certus esse videtur, cum habemus epistolam Johannis III. papae (in notis ad Gregorii M. Reg. III, 57, ed. Bened.) datam 10. Kal. Oct. imperante dom. Iustino aug., qua huic Petro pallium tributum est. Itaque Petrus IV. a. 569 (date de Pâques: 21 avril; littera dominicalis F) Sept. 15 consecratus est». Par conséquent il ne faut pas prétendre, comme certains érudits l'ont fait, que d'habitude on abrégeait le jeûne coutumier en plaçant l'ordination épiscopale dans la soirée du samedi. Jeûne prolongé ou non, ou même pas de jeûne du tout avant l'ordination des évêques ne dépendait que de la discrétion du pape. L'autre exemple se rap-

qu'il désirait appliquer à l'édition proprement dite de ses ouvrages¹. Ce n'est qu'un subterfuge que de prétendre qu'un sacramentaire n'était pas tellement important, puisque la saine doctrine chrétienne, dont Grégoire se sentait avant tout responsable, était en jeu. Il n'est aucunement étonnant qu'à Rome on n'aurait pas longtemps admis l'attribution du sacramentaire à Honorius par exemple, sur le nom duquel reposait le blâme d'avoir, sans s'en douter du reste, favorisé le monothélisme. Ni sa piété ingénue, ni la splendeur dont il avait entouré le culte liturgique (le pillage partiel du Latran peu après sa mort témoigne de cette splendeur fastueuse) ne pouvait effacer cette tâche. Du reste il fallait un grand nom et on avait celui du grand Grégoire, dont les libelli étaient largement exploités dans la composition du sacramentaire, le nom de celui dont les *libelli sacratorii* étaient à peu près les plus récents dans les archives du Latran.

Il y a un autre argument important qui semble plaider contre la composition d'un sacramentaire complètement organisé par Grégoire, qui avait l'habitude d'être extrêmement circonspect avant de permettre l'édition de tel de ses ouvrages. Il ab-

porte à l'évêque Maximien de Ravenne, ordonné le 14 octobre 546 par le pape Vigile (littera dominicalis G) selon Agnellus, l. c., numéro 70, p. 326: «Qui (sc. imperator), excogitato consilio, iussit cunsecrari beatum Maximianum Polensem diaconum episcopum a Vigilio papa in civitate Patras apud Achaiam pridie Idus Octubris, ind. 10, . . . » Au sujet des dimanches dans la liturgie papale et des ordinations épiscopales le jour du dimanche, voir: C. Coebergh, Le sacramentaire gélasiien ancien, une compilation de clercs romanisants du VII^e siècle, dans: Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft VII, 1, 1962, au chapitre VI. Les dimanches dans la liturgie papale, pp. 85–87; idem: Notes sur le Sacramentaire d'Hadrien (H, dans Studia Patristica V, Berlin 1962, p. 19). Il aurait été utile d'ajouter dans cette dernière publication en sous-titre: Le livre stationnal adapté à l'usage du remplaçant du pape.

¹ Il faut insister sur le soin de S. Grégoire pour l'édition de ses œuvres. Voici quelques exemples. D'abord *XL HOMILIARUM IN EVANGELIA*, *libri duo* (PL 76, col. 1075) *Praefatio. Ad Secundinum Tauromenitanum episcopum: Inter missarum solemnia, ex his quae diebus certis in hac Ecclesia legi ex more solent sancti Evangelii quadraginta lectiones exposui . . .* (col. 1076) *Sed quidam fratres sacri verbi studio ferventes, antequam ad propositum modum ea quae dixeram subtili emendatione perducerem, transtulerunt . . .* (col. 1078). *Tua itaque fraternitas . . . si praedictum locum Evangelii invenerit sub dubietate prolatum, vel easdem homilias repererit ita ut praedixi non esse dispositas, has in emendatas esse cognoscat, et eas iuxta quas per praesentem portitorum mittere studui corrigat, nulloque modo illas sine emendatione pape.*

horrait et désapprouvait plusieurs fois les éditions subreptices que le zèle intempestif de certains disciples fit voir le jour sans son autorisation. Sa lettre à Léandre, citée plus haut, témoigne entre autres de son soin pointilleux, quoique non pas en ce qui concerne les lois de la grammaire ou de la rhétorique, qui ne l'intéressaient que médiocrement. C'était sa doctrine qui était en jeu, ou plutôt la foi et la doctrine chrétiennes elles-mêmes qui lui tenaient à cœur au dessus de tout. Il vivait dans la conviction que Dieu l'avait destiné *ad lucrandas animas*, et il voulait avant tout que lui et ses collègues dans le saint ministère accompliraient fidèlement cette vocation. Le reste lui importait fort peu. Or, il est sans conteste que le soin d'une saine doctrine s'étendait aussi au texte des oraisons composées par lui-même ou choisies dans les *libelli sacramentorum* de certains de ses prédecesseurs Léon, Gélase ou d'autres encore, comme Vigile. C'est bien lui qui a introduit le *Pater* (avec son embolisme probablement) au Canon de la Messe, ainsi que la clausule *diesque nostros* etc. dans le *Hanc igitur*. C'est lui qui a défendu les pratiques liturgiques de la Rome de son temps contre les objections de Jean de Syracuse. Les stations organisées par lui à l'occasion d'une procession de pénitence à cause de la peste, ou simplement mentionnées dans ses 40 homélies sur les évangiles qu'il a prêchées dans ces basiliques nous sont garants d'une activité liturgique intense. Ces souvenirs ont joué probablement aussi un rôle non-négligeable dans l'attribution précoce de la composition d'un sacramentaire complet au grand Grégoire. Il n'y a qu'à rappeler les exemples de la mentalité des historiens du haut-moyen âge que j'ai relevé plus haut. Qu'il me soit donc permis de conclure que l'argumentation de H. Ashworth n'a été aucunement infirmée par la démonstration défectiveuse de Klaus Gam-

remanere permittat. Editae autem in scrinio sanctae Ecclesiae nostrae retinentur, ut si qui forte a tua fraternitate longe sunt, hic inveniant, unde in his quae emendatae sunt certiores fiant. Un autre exemple: *Homiliarum in Ezechiem prophetam libri duo. Lib. I. Praefatio. Dilectissimo fratri Mariano episcopo, Gregorius servus servorum Dei. Homilias quae in beatum Ezechiem prophetam, ita ut coram populo loquebar, exceptae sunt, multis curis irruentibus in abolitione reliqueram. Sed post annos octo, petentibus fratribus, notariorum schedas requirere studui, ea quae, favente Domino transcurrrens, in quantum ab angustis tribulationum licuit, emendavi.* J'ai déjà mentionné le cas des *Moralia in Job*, à propos du plagiat de Jean Diacre. Il n'y a donc pas lieu d'insister.

ber¹. Dans la situation actuelle des recherches il paraît plus probable que Grégoire le Grand n'a pas composé un sacramentaire complètement organisé; ce n'est point par lui-même, mais bien plus tardivement que son nom a été rattaché à ce livre, où l'on ne trouve par exemple pas la moindre trace de station à Saint-Pierre au 2^e dimanche après Pâques ou des Saints-Nérée-et-Achillée dont la fête n'est même plus mentionnée dans l'*Hadrienum* ni dans le *Patavinum* (Cod. Pad. 47), quoique ce dernier mentionne encore cette église comme lieu de la station du lundi de la semaine sainte. Dans H c'est déjà *AD SANCTAM PRAXIDEM*. Ces stations sont rappelées dans l'homiliaire de Grégoire, ainsi que celle *IN BASILICA BEATORUM JOANNIS ET PAULI* (34^e homélie *in Evangelia*) et de même celle *IN BASILICA BEATORUM APOSTOLORUM PHILIPPI ET JACOBI* au 2^e dimanche après la Pentecôte. Mais attendons

¹ On peut aussi reprocher à Gamber un défaut de méthode. Il constate que dans l'édition des *XL Homiliarum in Evangelia libri duo* il y a des indications qui font supposer l'usage de 5 dimanches de l'Avent au temps de S. Grégoire à Rome en 590. Alors Gamber écrit: «Also fällt dieses Jahr 590 für die Entstehung des Gr weg, da dieses deutlich nur 4 Adventssonntage kennt, wobei der 4. aliturgisch war. Im darauffolgenden Jahr 591 (Ostern am 15. April) fielen die Sonntage im Advent auf den 2., 9. und 16. Dezember. Möglicherweise hat damals Gregor die Änderung der ursprünglichen 5 in 4 Sonntage vorgenommen. Der Grund ist nicht ersichtlich». Dès qu'il constate un désaccord entre les documents et son hypothèse, Gamber recourt à une nouvelle hypothèse (*in casu*: une réforme de la durée de l'Avent par Grégoire au sujet de laquelle nous ne possédons aucun renseignement!) afin d'adapter les indications des documents à sa première hypothèse (*in casu*: la composition d'un sacramentaire pleinement organisé par Grégoire le Grand). Attendons plutôt l'édition critique des *XL Homiliarum in Evangelia libri duo*, promise par R. Étaix (voir: E. Dekkers: *Clavis Patrum latinorum, editio altera*, numéro 1711) où un ancien manuscrit de Barcelone, d'une haute importance (cfr. P. Puyol y Tuban, *Butletti de la Bibl. de Catalunya*, n. 8, V-VI, 1918-1919, 186-194), pourra jeter peut-être quelque lumière sur des points obscurs de la liturgie stationnaire à Rome pendant les premières années du pontificat de Grégoire. Les affirmations gratuites sur le terrain de l'histoire de la liturgie ne sont d'aucune utilité. C'est là hélas le côté très faible des travaux de Gamber; jusqu'ici ce sont seulement ses descriptions et ses renseignements sur un certain nombre de manuscrits liturgiques (en faisant abstraction des suppositions fantastiques de Gamber) qui rendent de grands services. Voir: *Sakramentartypen* (Beuron 1958) et un nouveau recueil plus ample qui verra bientôt le jour à Fribourg.

Post scriptum: Dans l'intervalle ce volume a vu le jour, à savoir K. Gamber, *Codices liturgici latini antiquiores* (= *Spicilegium Friburgensis Subsidia*, 1), Freiburg/Schweiz 1963. Cf. EL 79. 1965, 58-66 (= F. Dell'Oro, *Catalogus antiquorum fontium liturgicorum*).

l'édition critique de cet Homiliaire, annoncée par R. Étaix et tant désirée, avant de porter un jugement définitif. Au moins jusqu'ici la balance semble pencher en faveur de mon opinion énoncée plus haut et renforcée d'arguments non-négligeables.

Quant à la réminiscence du pape Grégoire et d'Honorius (voir plus haut p. 183) elle concerne un système de lectures scripturaires "per annum". On la retrouve dans deux lettres de Théodemar, abbé du Mont Cassin, l'une adressée "ad Theodoricum gloriosum" (778–797), l'autre à Charlemagne (s. IX. inc.), cf. K. Hallinger, *Corpus consuetudinum monasticarum I*, Siegburg 1963, 131–132 et 160.

Phases in Liturgical History

J. D. CRIGHTON, Pershore

That our own time is one of liturgical renewal is a fact so obvious that it hardly needs mentioning, but it has brought with it a good deal of liturgy-making which has become almost an industry. This activity, however necessary, is none the less somewhat disturbing. There is a certain artificiality about the whole procedure that reminds one of nothing so much as handbooks of good manners compiled by titled ladies for the lower classes. Manners are something you grow up with and liturgy is something that developed naturally in epochs when there was time for it to do so. Even in the early centuries the process of growth was far from consistent, yet it was the result of responses on the part of the worshipping church to new needs. As the liturgy of the Mass moved out of the small churches of the third century into the basilicas there was an elaboration of ceremonial and the adoption of certain customs from pagan Rome such as the carrying of lights before bishops who were equated with senators. In the fifth century, if not before, processions which were a feature of Roman liturgical life became very imposing affairs accompanied by psalm-singing. Formulae became fixed and a certain style, both of worship and of language, gave to the Roman rite a definite and recognizable character which it has never since lost. How far the formulae were influenced by a lingering pagan worship it is difficult to say, though some have seen in words like *rataam* and *adscriptam* of the Roman Canon the traces of such influence. The solemn proclamation of the eucharistic prayer is generally said to be related to the style of the Roman pagan orators and a St. Augustine and a St. Ambrose had learnt their lesson to great effect in that school. In a word, the first development of the Roman rite was in fact an adaptation to the pagan culture of Rome.

It will be clear that this has a lesson for us in our own time though no doubt the complexities of our situation and culture – or lack of it – make a similar process correspondingly difficult.

In the history of liturgies we note the tendency towards uniformity. It had started in Rome at least by the end of the fourth century as we can see from the famous letter of Innocent I. The nucleus of what we now call the Roman liturgy did indeed develop in the city of Rome in the fourth, fifth and sixth centuries and this was its most creative period. After this non-Roman factors were more influential. Gaul, through the English monk, Alcuin, Germany and even Spain made their contributions in various ways and as they became attached to the Roman nucleus they were carried back to Rome, thence to be transmitted to a wider sphere and in the end to be imposed as the rite of the Roman Church. Even in our own day the same pattern of events can be observed. The changes now being made in the Roman rite have come up from the bottom and after a certain sifting are being imposed on the Church as a whole.

Another observation may be made: the Roman rite as it has been practised since Gregory the Great is essentially a papal rite which Alcuin had to adapt to make it viable in the churches north of the Alps. The position of the fraction was dictated by the needs of papal ceremonial. The pope communicated at the throne as he still does, but Gregory wished to recite the *Pater* over the elements on the altar so he put that prayer between the end of the Canon and the fraction. Piety has its rights no doubt, but it was unfortunate that the fraction was even further removed from the words of institution, thus separating two acts which were originally combined.

These tendencies will be illustrated by the two or three considerations that follow.

The Roman Eucharistic Prayer

Even if tendencies can be observed they, like all generalisations, need checking and if there is a certain truth in the statement that the nucleus of the Roman Canon had its origin in Rome, it is not only difficult to prove this from documents, but it disguises a process of formation that preceded the present form.

As is well known, the first witness to the text of what is now the Roman Canon is to be found in St. Ambrose's *De Sacramentis* (V, 21–VI, 20). But even this cannot with absolute certainty be said to have had its origin in Rome. In spite of the fact that the occupants of the Roman See in the fourth century could not be said to be strong or colourful personalities, the city did possess a certain prestige. Ambrose himself, even while differing from Rome in certain customs, said: 'In all things we follow Rome's example and rite'¹.

But the question whether St. Ambrose's text was or was not a Roman one seems to be misconceived. We are all aware of the temptation to read history backwards and to see a centralising power at work in Rome long before it had in fact begun. It would seem to be a mistake to look for a fixed formula, much less for an official one, at a time when fixed formulae for the consecration prayer can only recently have emerged. If a fully Latin liturgy had appeared in Rome only as recently as 350 A. D. (and this I find difficult to believe) there will have been precisely at the time when St. Ambrose's prayer was drawn up a number of similar attempts most of which disappeared when the Roman Canon had established itself. Long enough ago Gregory Dix² suggested there were a number of North Italian texts (though characteristically he did not quote them or refer to them in detail) and, we may add, there were South Italian texts too. It is clear from various sources that Benevento was an influential liturgical centre.

That there was a certain variety of texts of the eucharistic prayer seems to be more certain after a study of Dr. Klaus Gamber in a recent number of *Ephemerides liturgicae*³.

Dr. Gamber studies and compares three documents which he identifies as follows: Z *Codex Vaticanus* 4770: the *Stowe Missal*: and a *Codex Ratisbonensis* which is to be found here at Oxford in the Bodleian (Bibl. Bodleiana, MS Auct. D I/20) which is dated to the end of the ninth century. If Gamber's conclusions are accepted it seems that he throws light on three matters of some interest: 1. There were other texts of the consecration prayer in circulation different from the Roman Canon, and the

¹ 'cuius typum in omnibus sequimur et formam'. (*De Sacr.* III, 5).

² *The Shape of the Liturgy*, London, 1945, 539–541.

³ E. L. 74, 103–114: 'Ein Römisches Eucharistiegebet aus dem 4.–5. Jahrhundert'.

Codex Vaticanus Z would seem to provide some basis for a reconstruction of the first part of the former. 2. It becomes possible to establish exactly when the *Sanctus* was officially inserted into the Canon. 3. The dating of the Preface of the Trinity to the fourth century achieves a certain probability.

1. It would take too long and be a little wearisome in a paper like this to follow Gamber in his close and acute examination of these documents. His first task was of course to establish priorities. Which of the three documents is the oldest? All three are clearly related for in all three we find Trinitarian phrases in various stages of corruption. Thus: *non in unius (sic) trinitatis personae sed in unius trinitatis substantie (sic)* (*Codex Vat.*). Or again, *non in unius singularitate personae sed unius trinitatis substantiae* (*Codex Ratisbonensis*). I do not think we can doubt that the documents are related and Gamber sees in the *Cod. Vat.* the original of the other two. It is either a Roman or an Italian text which may derive from Benevento or some centre south of Rome. One of his main reasons for thinking so brings us to the second point.

2. The interesting feature of the original text (*Cod. Vat.*) is that it has no *Sanctus* and Gamber in another place¹ has called attention to the fact that there are in existence certain texts of the beginning of the fifth century that are without the *Sanctus*. As is well known, there has been a certain amount of speculation about the time when the *Sanctus* was inserted into the Roman Canon. It is known that it is to be found in the consecration prayer of Serapion about 350 A. D. and it is commonly held that relationships between Rome and Alexandria remained close. But hitherto I think it is true to say that the date of the insertion of the *Sanctus* into the Roman Canon has remained uncertain. Thus in the latest and excellent text-book, *L'Eglise en Prière* (p. 390)², the date suggested is about 400 A. D. It is true that *Cod. Rat.* and the text of the Stowe Missal have the *Sanctus*, and it is as certain that the three texts are related. Gamber holds that it has been interpolated into *Stowe* and *Cod. Rat.* and reconstructs the history of the matter like this. It is well known that *Stowe* is eccentric to the Roman tradition and it is usually thought

¹ 'Das kampanische Meßbuch als Vorläufer des Gelasianum', *Sacris Erudiri*, 12, 1961, 5–11.

² Ed. A. G. Martimorto, *Desclée*, Tournai, Paris, New York (1961).

to have borrowed its texts from Spain or the East. Gamber thinks that when Palladius went to Ireland in the time of Pope Celestine (422–432) he took with him an old text either identical with or similar to our *Cod. Vat.* which was without the *Sanctus*. Gamber recalls that the *Liber Pontificalis* (I, 128) attributes to Sixtus I the insertion of the *Sanctus* into the consecration prayer: *ut intra actionem, sacerdos incipiens, populus hymnum decantaret Sanctus* (I, 128). If the text that Palladius took to Ireland was without the *Sanctus*, may it not be that the statement in *Liber Pontificalis* is to be attributed to Sixtus III, the immediate successor of Celestine and in fact the immediate predecessor of Leo? It would seem to be a very probable deduction and if we may rely on it, it shows that Rome, as in the time of Innocent I, was taking an active part in the formation of the Roman rite. We may suppose, too, that the influence of Alexandria had something to do with it, though evidence is wanting. It does, however, seem to indicate that here we have a typical phase that was to be repeated throughout the centuries. First, there is a period of individual effort or even of experimentation, then there is the process of assimilation, and finally the authoritative act of Rome by which the addition is made official. Further, if this view is sound, it means that from the beginning of the fifth century to the end of St. Leo's reign there was a tradition of liturgical activity in the Roman See.

The way these pieces of evidence fit in is impressive and it is difficult to resist the conclusion that here we have the solution of the problem of the insertion of the *Sanctus* into the Canon. But it raises another question or seems to. In the prayer as reconstructed by Gamber towards the end of his article, the *Te igitur* in the form we know it, as well as the *Memento vivorum* and the *Communicantes*, are missing. Does this mean that we have to go over once again all that had been said and agreed on about the famous letter of Innocent I to the Bishop of Gubbio? Does it mean that there would be no place *ut inter sacra mysteria nominentur* the names of those to be prayed for? It does not seem necessarily to follow. First, the text may very well be older than the time of Innocent and it seems to be agreed that his particular view of things had no very long history behind it. Secondly, there is a prayer for the Church beginning *Per ipsum te Domine suppliciter deprecamur* which makes room for intercessions. And finally there is a long *Hanc igitur* of the old style which leaves

room for an indefinite number of persons or categories of persons that would have been mentioned at this point. It may be, however, that this particular text is more recent than the rest of the prayer.

3. We may now examine Gamber's reconstruction of the prayer and ask whether it supplies a clue to what the Canon was like before it was re-written in the fifth century.

It begins with *Vere dignum* and continues with a long list of the names of God, thus witnessing to an ancient form: the calling of the names of God as in the Jewish Berakhoth. This member is followed by another, very much like the first part of the *Te Deum* which others have supposed may have once been part of a eucharistic prayer: *Te confitemur, te benedicimus . . .* May it not be that this part of the prayer naturally suggested the inclusion of the *Sanctus*, as in fact in the *Te Deum*?

Then comes a bridge passage, an extended form of the *Per Christum Dominum nostrum: Per quem salus mundi, . . . per quem resurrectio mortuorum . . .* leading to the prayer for the Church which seems to suggest an earlier form of the *Te igitur: Per ipsum te Domine suppliciter deprecamur uti accepta habeas et benedicas haec dona haec munera haec sancta sacrificia illibata in primis quae tibi offerimus pro ecclesia tua sancta catholica quam pacificare etc.* There is surprisingly no mention of the bishop or bishops and none of the pope. This is followed by the long *Hanc igitur* and the *Quam oblationem* as now.

Why there should be no mention of pope or bishop remains unexplained. But the *Per ipsum te Domine suppliciter deprecamur* does seem to be an earlier form of *Te igitur*. It runs naturally and logically out of what has gone before and, as Jungmann has pointed out, our *Te igitur* resumes the original address to God: *Domine, sancte Pater*, etc. and repeats the *Per Christum Dominum nostrum*. The insertion of the *Sanctus* would certainly demand a re-writing and the existing *Te igitur* seems thus to have been re-written and yet to have left as much of the old as possible.

Finally, there is the matter of the Preface of the Trinity. Chavasse endeavoured to show that that Preface is to be attributed to St. Leo and others have followed him in this view, though it is rejected by Jungmann (*Pastoral Liturgy*, p. 35, n. 12, London, 1962). If this prayer is a possibly fourth century text Jungmann's view becomes all the more probable and, if I may express a personal view, it would seem to be highly likely that in the cen-

tury when the doctrine of the Holy Trinity was being so fiercely debated and argued theological controversy should be reflected in liturgical prayer. The relationship between life and liturgy in those days was close and the men of that time – and of a later time – had no inhibitions about introducing their theological pre-occupations, or even their whims, into the solemn prayer of the Church.

From the Libelli Missarum to Gregory the Great

Our next period witnesses to a similar development. There is a widespread diversity ending in a certain uniformity though both terms of this statement need to be understood unless we are to risk an over-simplification which would in fact be a distortion. As Canon Chavasse has written of this period: 'Properly speaking it is not a question of a diversity which opposes to one another successive stages of a Roman liturgy which has developed with time. Such a diversity has long been recognised and admitted by historians. What we have to do with is a diversity which in the same period contrasts different Roman churches with each other and which in proportions varying from one church to another affect at the same time or separately the general liturgical ordering of the celebration and the eucological formulae which it uses'¹. Various factors were in play to produce this diversity, factors that were more liturgical than literary – for we must remember that we are dealing with a living liturgy – and the picture presented by modern research is one of rites that varied from church to church even in the city of Rome. Nor was it only the sacramentaries that were affected. Some recent research of Father Löw into the collections of sermons to be read at the Divine Office reveals a similar diversity and as Chavasse remarks 'has finally delivered us from the illusion of an ancient Roman liturgy which was uniform, indeed monolithic'².

It may however be remarked that if much was fluid there was much that remained fixed, notably the Roman Canon that does not seem to have varied from the fifth century onwards.

Still, the diversity remains a fact, there was no notion of constructing a fixed liturgy, much less of imposing one and, as

¹ Le Sacramentaire Gélasien, p. XXIV (Desclée, Paris, Rome, New York, 1958).

² Op. cit. pp. XXV–XXVI.

Chavasse observes, this made it possible for the oriental popes of the seventh century to introduce new rites (such as the *Agnus Dei*) and new feasts, notably those of the Blessed Virgin¹. Furthermore, this outlook lasted until the end of our period and the redaction of liturgical formulae went on well into the seventh century. Against this background it is easy to agree with Chavasse that St. Gregory in his work on the sacramentary that bears his name was doing no more than conform to custom and had no intention of imposing the book on the whole city of Rome, much less upon the Church in the West. There remain his famous answers to Augustine's queries to show that he had no such intentions.

This picture of great diversity rather dismayed Chavasse for he felt he was faced not so much with diversity as with a liturgical incoherence and the pre-Gelasian, pre-Gregorian sacramentary that for other reasons he felt obliged to suppose to account for what was common in the Gelasian, Gregorian and some of the Gallican books, fits into this perspective as a stabilising influence. Unfortunately, the existence of this book remains to be proved. Dom Henry Ashworth in a review of Chavasse² is very severe about it: 'Much that the author has to say concerning this non-extant source, of which no-one has ever heard, may be true. It may solicit notional assent, but the impression remains that there is a good deal of doubt about it'. One of the difficulties in pre-supposing such a text is that we have not in any case a 'pure' Gelasian. If we had, the picture might look different. The other is that a certain amount of the support for its existence comes from textual criticism of the books in question and that is a very delicate and complex matter. Some of the texts are obviously corrupt and I am not always convinced myself that the variants are to be explained along the lines of conventional textual criticism.

However this may be, used as a working hypothesis, the existence of an earlier sacramentary coming between the so-called Leonine and the Gelasian and Gregorian helps to relate texts whose similarities otherwise remain inexplicable.

The general picture then between the end of the fifth century and the time of St. Gregory is, according to modern research, as follows: —

¹ Op. cit. p. XXV.

² Clergy Review, July 1961, 414—419.

First, there was the redaction of the *libelli missarum* for special occasions which after use were stored in the *scrinium* of the Lateran and perhaps elsewhere too. Some of these *libelli* have been isolated in recent years. Dom Capelle was the first to identify certain Masses of Gelasius in the Verona sacramentary¹. Canon Chavasse followed him with the identification of a group of Masses to be attributed to Pope Vigilius and a student of his, G. Pomarès, carried forward Capelle's work, identifying eighteen Masses of Gelasius².

If we add to these a Mass for the Ascension which Capelle attributed to St. Leo³ we see that not only was there a good deal of activity in *libelli*-making but that the popes took a leading part. This is perhaps one of the more surprising results of modern research.

Further, as Chavasse remarks, there was not only the construction of Masses but later on, the older books were plundered to provide what he calls 'pièces choisies' for different occasions and he instances the series of prayers *ad populum* for the Masses of Lent as they are found in the Gregorian sacramentary⁴.

This process did not stop with the sixth century. Gregory's work, whatever it was, was in the same line, and if it is true that Boniface IV, one of his near successors, was the man responsible for the Gregorian as we have come to know it, he was doing much the same as his nearer or more remote predecessors. Granted that *Greg.* soon acquired a unique prestige thanks to its association with Pope Gregory, yet it was not thought to be a definitive book which should halt the process. Further additions were made to the Roman liturgy in the seventh century, notably the feasts of the Blessed Virgin instituted by pope Sergius I. It is perhaps

¹ 'Messes du pape s. Gérase dans le sacramentaire léonien' in *Revue Bénédicte*, 56, 1945–1946, 12–41; reprinted in *Travaux Liturgiques II*, Louvain 1962, 79–105.

² A. Chavasse, 'Messes du pape Vigile (537–555) dans le sacramentaire léonien', *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 64, 1950, 161–213; 66, 1952, 145–219.

G. Pomarès, *Lettre contre les Lupercales et Dix-huit Messes du Sacraminaire Léonien*, Paris, 1959.

³ 'Une messe de s. Léon pour l'Ascension', *Travaux Liturgiques*, II, 71–78.

⁴ Le Sacramentaire gélasien, 681 and 585–586, where he says: 'Les pièces qui leur sont empruntées ne s'y retrouvent pas en ordre dispersé, ce qui rendrait le fait extrêmement ambigu. Dans quinze cas sur dix-sept, ces pièces sont employés comme oraisons *super populum*. Le caractère systématique de ce remploi suffit à assurer que ces pièces viennent d'une source très proche des sections 201 à 204 de l'Hadrianum.'

not generally remarked that this would have led to the compilation of new *libelli* for these occasions. By the middle of the eighth century this kind of papal activity seems to have ceased. Thenceforth the centre of liturgical interest gradually passed to Gaul and eventually to Germany where the prototypes of our present missal and pontifical were formed. In any case, it was not only the popes who were engaged in liturgy-making, and it would give a false picture of the situation if we were to leave the matter there. One of Canon Chavasse's most valuable findings – and it seems to have been generally accepted – is that alongside the papal liturgy was that of the title churches which needed and had their own books, of which the Gelasian is the only survivor. It is not, alas, in its pure state, for the same author has established that it has many additions and no doubt it was the subject of much re-editing. There was yet a third group of churches, those outside the walls and often connected with the cemeteries, though they seem to have had little influence on subsequent liturgies. All these liturgies were contemporaneous and it is only through a gradual realisation of this truth that it has become possible to interpret some aspects of the liturgy of the sacramentaries with any confidence.

An illustration of the importance of the distinction between the papal and presbyteral liturgies may be seen in an attempt of Chavasse's to explain the disappearance of the *oratio super sindonem* from the Gregorian book and its retention by the Gelasian. It is well known that in the present Roman rite the celebrant sings *Oremus* after the Creed and no prayer follows. Various explanations of this anomaly have been given of which the most respectable is that there was once a prayer here, called after its title in the Ambrosian rite *oratio super sindonem*, which immediately followed the *Oremus*¹.

As is well known, in the Gelasian Sacramentary there is a second prayer placed immediately after the collect that is regarded as a sort of *oratio super sindonem*. Chavasse agrees with this but says that it is only a partial explanation and so he asks the question: Why was this prayer dropped from the Gregorian book? and in his answer seeks to elucidate this matter and incidentally to clear up the nature of this prayer².

¹ Cf. Jungmann who cites Wilson (Gelasian Sacramentary) and A. Wilmart: *Missarum Sollemnia*, II, 259 (French translation, Paris, 1952).

² A. Chavasse. L'Oraison «super sindonem» dans la liturgie romaine, Rev. Bénédictine 70, 1960, 313–323.

It should be observed that the appearance of this prayer coincided with the disappearance of the *Orationes Sollemnes* which were replaced by the *Deprecatio litaniae* by pope Gelasius towards the end of the fifth century, and, as Chavasse observes, the older Masses of the Leonine sacramentary have not this second prayer after the collect. In other words, there is nothing primitive about it. Secondly, he insists that it was not an isolated text but was the priestly prayer concluding the *Deprecatio*. Later, analyzing these prayers in the Gelasian, he remarks that they evoke a (previous) prayer of supplication addressed to the divine mercy who is asked to give ear and to answer. At the conclusion of his article he cites alongside prayers and petitions of the *Deprecatio Gelasii* to show how often the prayer echoes the litany (p. 320 foll.). This corresponds to an ancient pattern of litanic prayer: a collect summed up something that had gone before and this is supported by the ancient Eastern practice where the deacon recited the petitions, the people made their response and the priest concluded with a prayer¹. This in any case would seem to elucidate the nature of this prayer and to 'situate' it in the liturgy.

The same writer suggests further that there is no need to suppose – as is generally done – that when the *Deprecatio* took the place of the *Orationes sollemnes* it was moved *immediately* to the beginning of the Mass, to the place where the *Kyrie* now is and he brings forward some evidence from 6th–7th century Gallican texts to support this point of view. So he holds it is not too venturesome to think that Rome had placed the *Deprecatio* *after* the Gospel, together with its concluding prayer, and that such a view enables us to find an explanation of why the prayer was dropped from the Gregorian book. Yet, by the end of the sixth century, as we know from the Gregorian sacramentary, the *Deprecatio* had been placed at the beginning of the Mass and since it will have been followed by the collect of the day it will have lost its concluding prayer. But why was this change made? Chavasse finds the explanation in the differing entrance rites of the papal and presbyteral churches.

In the papal rite on certain days (Purification, Major Litany, certain Lenten feriae and Holy Saturday: cf. Andrieu, *Ordines Romani*, III, pp. 235–236, 247–249, 259–260, 273, 297) the

¹ Cf. Jungmann, op. cit., II, 255.

rite of entry was as follows: the procession from the "collect" church to the stational church; on approaching the latter the litany is intoned and by the time the people are in church, it is finished. Then the introit is begun as the celebrant and ministers move towards the altar, the Mass beginning with the collect of the day. On all these occasions the *Kyrie* is wanting and on all other occasions when there is no pre-Mass litany there is the introit followed by the *Kyrie*, and as St. Gregory himself bears witness, on certain more solemn days, the *Deprecatio*. Chavasse therefore suggests that on those days when there was no litany the *Deprecatio* with its collect was moved to the beginning of the Mass as a sort of compensation for its absence. When of course the *Deprecatio* disappeared, as it seems to have done shortly after St. Gregory's time, the concluding collect disappeared with it.

Chavasse would see 'a kind of indirect proof' of this suppression if it could be proved that the structure of the Gelasian liturgy was opposed to such a change. This he thinks he can see in the rite of entry as it is suggested by the Gelasian book itself. He notes, for instance, the emphasis in the Gelasian rubric on the silence that is to be observed at the beginning of the Good Friday service: *Et egreditur sacerdos de sacrario cum sacris ordinibus cum silentio nihil canentes*¹ and thinks this observance is peculiar to that day. Other indications lead him to suppose that the entrance chant of the liturgy of the presbyteral churches was *always* a Litany ending with *Agnus Dei*. In these circumstances, he remarks, there would have been no need to transfer the *Deprecatio* to the beginning of the Mass as there was already a litany there. Thus, it could only have been placed after the gospel and for this reason the Gelasian book retained the *oratio super sindonem* too.

It must be admitted that all is not equally certain in the above reconstruction but it does provide an answer to a hitherto unresolved problem and so deserves consideration. If it were supported by subsequent research, it would give a further demonstration of the inter-action of different rites within Rome itself and would serve as an example of the sometimes curious factors that led to liturgical changes.

If one may add one speculation to another, it is that perhaps one reason why Pope Sergius I added the *Agnus Dei* to the

¹ Ed. Mohlberg, 395.

papal liturgy was that so frequently it was absent from it (i. e. when there was no procession), that the people were attached to it and that the pope decided to satisfy their desires.

The Making of the Gregorian Sacramentary

It should be said at this point that I do not wish to go into the difficult matter of the compilation of the Gregorian Sacramentary. I wish to try and situate it in the process of liturgy-making that had been going on since Leo the Great and even before. Commonly, it appears or is made to appear as a sort of liturgical watershed. Before it there was a certain degree of diversity which we now know was rather greater than and different from what had formerly been imagined, and after it there was an impressive uniformity which was not universal in Europe only on account of the corruption and barbarity of the transalpines. This does not seem to be the true picture. Gaul had had a more than respectable liturgy of its own and liturgical life broke down on account of the devastation brought about by the Arab invasions. At the time of Gregory the Great the Gallican liturgy, however difficult it may be to reconstruct it in detail, was flourishing and I do not think it ever occurred to anyone beyond the Alps to look to Rome for leadership in rites and ceremonies. That there was a certain interest in what was done at Rome is undeniable and infiltration of one kind or another did begin long before the Gregorian book was received in Gaul.

The situation of Gregory the Great in this matter of liturgy is indeed a curious one. We know certain details of his liturgical activity. But for some time now the limits of that activity have been reduced. It was once thought that if he did not create what was called Gregorian chant he had a big part in its formation as we have come to know it. I do not think anyone holds that view now. He was commonly thought to have been the only-begetter of the so-called Gregorian Sacramentary and that henceforth this became the official book of Rome and perhaps of most of Italy. Dom Capelle¹ did indeed reveal 'the hand' of St. Gregory in the sacramentary and it was through working over this material that Dom Henry Ashworth detected or thought he detected a second hand

¹ *Travaux Liturgiques*, II, 161–175.

in the book. In a paper read to this Conference in 1955 he suggested that the second hand may very well have been that of Boniface IV, a great admirer and disciple of Gregory's¹. Since then in a number of papers he has examined the evidence, both internal and external, and remains of the opinion that there are at least two hands discernible in the compilation of the book². In an article in *Liturgy* (January, 1962) he summed up his findings as follows: 'The impression left by a study of the contents of the Sacramentary as a whole is that it is a composite document. It is not the work of one person alone. Attention has been drawn to the fact that the Sacramentary appears to have been thrown together in some haste. Many of the prayers tediously repeat each other. Some have been used as stock prayers and pushed into odd places up and down the book. Others, originally pronounced or composed by St. Gregory under the strain and stress of circumstance, are found in Masses to which such circumstances could not apply. The conclusion to which we are drawn by the force of such conflicting evidence is that the Sacramentary as it stands is not the work of one person and therefore not of St. Gregory alone. The only satisfactory explanation of the apparently contradictory facts, I would suggest, is that St. Gregory composed a certain number of prayers, but not a Sacramentary, and that at some subsequent date these were incorporated into an official, organised Roman Sacramentary for use as the papal stational Masses. How early after Gregory's death it is hard to say. There are indications that Pope Boniface IV composed the collect for the Dedication of the Pantheon, on 13th May, circa 613, imitating Gregory's style and vocabulary. It may well be that it was due to this pontiff's initiative that the first outlines of the *Gregorianum* took shape. Other popes no doubt added to the collection, until by the mid-eighth century there had come into existence a well-developed Service Book for use of the *Domnus Apostolicus*, which was traditionally held to be the work of St. Gregory the Great' (p. 15)³.

¹ *Studia Patristica*, II (TU 64), Berlin, 1957 pp. 3–16.

² In Quest of the Primitive *Gregorianum*, *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 72, 1958 pp. 319–322; cf. id., Did. St. Augustine bring the *Gregorianum* to England? *ibid.*, pp. 39–43. The Liturgical Prayers of St. Gregory the Great, *Traditio* 15, 1959 in which he examines the internal and external evidence.

³ In *Traditio* 15, 116 Dom Ashworth says he 'would place the composition of the *Gregorianum* as the official Papal Sacramentary during the pontificate of Honorius I (625–638)'.

There is another small factor pointing in the direction of Boniface IV's hand in the sacramentary. Working quite independently, Dom Coebergh in *Sacris Erudiri*¹ has sought to establish that the prayers of the Mass of St. Gregory were adapted from others referring to St. Leo and inserted by Boniface who was an enthusiastic admirer of St. Gregory². The case Dom Coebergh makes is a strong one and if supported would show both that Boniface had a hand in *Greg.* and the continuing activity of the popes in the compilation of the liturgical books.

If we add to this Dom Ashworth's statistics we get an impression of the mental climate in which this work was being done. Some 88 prayer formulae can with some confidence be attributed to Gregory in the *Hadrianum*³. To this we may add an unknown number of prayers by Boniface and no doubt other hands and as yet we have nothing more than the sort of activity that was going on in the fifth and sixth centuries. It is true that there was at the same time a good deal of revision and re-editing of the old prayers, and as Capelle has shown⁴ Gregory was active in this matter too. But there is no sign of a desire for uniformity, much less of a wish to impose these formularies on anyone else. It would seem that the circumstances of the seventh and eighth centuries need a good deal of close investigation to establish when an official papal sacramentary was compiled and what were the motives that prompted it.

That there was a continuing liturgical activity on the part of the popes is certain. Apart from Leo II (682–683) with his reputed skill in ecclesiastical chant, there are the important figures of Gregory II and Gregory III, both of whom showed a marked interest in matters liturgical. The first, who had a long reign for a

¹ 12, 1961, 372–404: 'La messe de Saint Grégoire dans le sacramentaire d'Hadrien'.

² The story is one of some complexity. Gregory remembered the somewhat hysterical reception of Pope Vigilius's body in 555 and was determined to make this impossible after his own death. He made certain regulations and bound his followers by an oath to keep them. But popular pressure grew, Boniface was enthusiastic but bound by the oath. He therefore edited the prayers making them deliberately ambiguous: the offertory prayer prays for the popes' (Leo and Gregory) souls and the collect and postcommunion seek their intercession!

³ H. Ashworth, 'Further Parallels to the "Hadrianum" from St. Gregory the Great's Commentary on the First Book of Kings': *Traditio* 16, 1960, 364–373.

⁴ *Travaux Liturgiques*, II, 161–175.

medieval pope and of whom it has been said that 'il accomplit une œuvre liturgique remarquable', organised the 'stations' for the Thursdays in Lent and like his earlier namesake compiled Masses from the Gelasian for these days¹. Gregory III showed a similar interest and promulgated a Mass for the Blessed Virgin and all the saints of which the text is extant². It is interesting to note that the text of the Canon had not yet become sacro-sacred: Gregory added a long clause to the *Communicantes*. Yet no doubt because the celebration was a purely local one, the feast has left no trace in subsequent liturgical books. Meanwhile, probably in the reign of Sergius, another book destined to have a very long future came into existence. This was the *Ordo Romanus I* of which the short recension was drawn up towards the end of the seventh century or in the beginning of the eighth³. It was to make its way to France there to be much copied from the second half of the eighth century onwards and with the Gregorian and Gelasian books was to be a chief factor in the formation of the Roman liturgy as we have come to know it.

It was in these ways that the use of the Roman liturgy spread to the North of Europe and we recall the strong Romanising tendencies of St. Benet Biscop and St. Wilfrid in England and the prolonged stay there of John, the chief Precentor of the Roman church. No doubt he took with him the comparatively new Gregorian book or books (these latter for the chant) and initiated the English into Roman ways. The results of his work can be seen in the council of Hatfield (680) when the Roman liturgy was imposed⁴. By the time of the council of Cloveshoe (747) which decreed that the liturgy should be celebrated 'iuxta exemplar uidelicet quod scriptum de romana habemus ecclesia'⁵, the Gregorian book was made official for the whole of England. It is an important event. It is the first instance of the acceptance of the papal liturgy in a country beyond the Alps.

But in this same period another tendency can be observed. Hitherto, the papal liturgy had peacefully penetrated both France and England, no doubt thanks to the prestige of Rome

¹ *Histoire de l'Eglise*, Fliche et Martin, t. 5, pp. 415–416.

² H. Leclercq, D. A. C. L., t. 13, coll. 1247–1248.

³ Andrieu, *Ordines*, t. II, pp. 38–51 (Louvain, 1948).

⁴ Bede, *Hist. eccles.*, IV, c. 16, ed. Plummer, pp. 240–241.

⁵ Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents relating to Great Britain*, III, p. 367. (cited in Ashworth, *Ephem. Liturg.* p. 43).

and the orderliness of the Roman books. Then first, Gregory II gave instructions to his legate, Martinianus, that the Bavarian clergy should keep exactly the liturgical traditions preserved from time immemorial in the apostolic see and enjoined upon Boniface the obligation of using the Roman ritual of baptism for preparing his catechumens. Thirty years later Pope Zachary severely forbids the Gallican custom of blessing the people before holy communion and shows very clearly that he wishes to impose Roman usage in Germany: *Regulam catholicae traditionis, suscepisti, frater amantissime; sic omnibus praedica omnesque doce, sicut a sancta romana, cui Deo auctore deservimus, accepisti ecclesia*¹. It is a new note of rigour, perhaps personal to Zachary, and shows that the Roman see was becoming conscious of the excellence of its liturgical tradition and of the need for some liturgical uniformity. These indications (of varying worth) point on to what I believe to have been the true watershed of liturgical history in the West, namely the initiative of Charlemagne and the work of Alcuin. Even if we agree with a recent writer² that their aim was 'non pas de romaniser mais d'unifier', the result was that the Roman books now became normative and, in spite of much variation in minor rites, the liturgy of the papal book adapted by Alcuin became the liturgy of the Western Church.

Modern Developments

Although much remains to be revealed, especially concerning the twelfth and thirteenth centuries upon which Father S. J. P. van Dijk and Dr. Joan Walker have already thrown some light³, the main lines of liturgical history are clear. The really centralising tendencies came with Gregory VII in the eleventh century and the chief casualty of his efforts was the all-but elimination of the Mozarabic rite in Spain. The liturgy he imposed on the Church was Roman, Gallican and Germanic, and that has remained our liturgy to this day. Nevertheless, centrifugal forces remained in play and by the end of the Middle Ages the liturgy was in a state of chaos. When, then, the Council of Trent and the popes

¹ Andrieu, *Ordines*, t. II, pp. XXIX–XXX. Andrieu remarks that the Gallican custom was not suppressed and continued for some long time.

² Deshusses in *Ephem. Liturgicae*, 75, 1961.

³ Cf. *inter alia*, *The Origins of the Modern Roman Liturgy*, London, 1959.

were faced with the task of liturgical reform, they felt that three things must be done; the liturgy must be restored to what they thought was its primitive Roman purity; they must preserve this purified and restored liturgy, and they must impose it on the whole Church. This uniformity was achieved largely by the construction of a rigid rubrical framework which it became a matter of conscience to observe, by the vigour of the papacy in pursuing the ideal of uniformity, and perhaps not least by the invention of printing which made the rapid multiplication of liturgical books a practical possibility for the first time.

We are probably still too near to the sixteenth century to evaluate objectively the work of the Council of Trent and of the popes who actually implemented the liturgical reform. That their work was providential can hardly be doubted when we reflect on the expansion of the Church into new continents. Some uniformity was undoubtedly a practical necessity. But perhaps the final judgement must be that on the one hand, the sixteenth century reform by its insistence on a rigid rubrical framework made the possibilities of adaptation in later ages insuperably difficult and on the other, that it did in fact preserve a recognizably Roman liturgy at a time when almost all the forces in Europe were making for its destruction.

But perhaps the irony of the whole situation is that uniformity was not achieved, at least in Europe, until the nineteenth century. The despots, whether benevolent or not, of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries maintained something of the centrifugal tendencies of the later Middle Ages and their obedient bishops, while clinging to a sometimes tenuous allegiance to Rome, indulged in a good deal of liturgy-making of varying quality. The story of the Neo-Gallican liturgies is well enough known. They witness to a desire, more or less explicit, to break through the rigid framework of the Tridentine rite and to adapt a liturgy which had already revealed its defects. What is less generally known, I think, is that similar tendencies were at work in German-speaking lands. Jungmann in a lecture delivered at Trier in 1961 called *Liturgische Erneuerung zwischen Barock und Gegenwart*¹ has drawn together material, much of which appeared in a book in 1940². The story it presents is a surprising one. There

¹ *Liturgisches Jahrbuch*, 12. Jahr, Heft I, 1962.

² W. Trapp, *Vorgeschichte und Ursprung der liturgischen Bewegung vorwiegend in Hinsicht auf das deutsche Sprachgebiet*, Regensburg, 1940.

we read that many of the *desideranda* as well as the *desiderata* of the modern liturgical movement were anticipated. The desire was expressed that there should be one altar in church and this near the people and turned towards them. The people should communicate sacramentally and not merely spiritually. The sermon should be preached after the gospel and expositions of the Blessed Sacrament during Mass should be much restricted. The teaching is found that parish worship is the celebration of the whole community and that the people should not be listless spectators (a phrase curiously echoing that of Pius XI nearly 150 years later!) is found. There was an insistence on the need for sound instruction if the people were to take their part properly in the liturgy and this participation would be secured through the singing of vernacular hymns. It is in 1777 that appears for the first time the hymn, 'Hier liegt vor deiner Majestät', that has since become so famous. Father Jungmann sees in all this the beginnings of the *Deutsche Hochamt* which has acquired *droit de cité* in German-speaking lands. With this went a certain disaffection for Latin chants in the Mass and, surprisingly, in the home of Haydn, Mozart and Beethoven, signs of an aversion for elaborate church music.

Naturally, the question of the vernacular raised its head. It was felt as a barrier but most were engagingly modest in their requests. A sort of principle was established, even in practice: What concerns the people should be in German; the rest in Latin. German-Latin rituals became common, the Breviary was translated for the benefit of the laity, and a form of German Vespers was evolved for public use which is still in use at Constance.

This and much more was being taught and discussed in this eighteenth century which was so unpropitious for liturgical worship. But as Jungmann observes¹ this movement had its weaker side. It was the child of the *Aufklärung* which took little account of tradition and, moving as it did rather on the periphery of the Church's life, was doomed, as was the Neo-Gallican venture, to a near sterility. Little enough remained to justify its existence.

But both these movements are interesting as showing that as long ago as the seventeenth century the deficiencies of the Tridentine reform were being felt and bishops and priests took

¹ Loc. cit., p. 9.

such measures as they thought necessary for the good of their people. It was not until the modern liturgical movement that the pleas for liturgical reform and for the possibility of adaptation achieved an 'ecclesial' dimension and in its last stages the intervention of the papacy has been decisive. Through the action of the popes and finally through the Second Vatican Council the aims of the liturgical movement have been incorporated into the life of the Church. The re-establishment of a unity in diversity, characteristic of the early centuries, is once more a possibility that lies open to the Church of the future.

Das Sakramentar von Salzburg als Quelle für das *Pragense*

K. GAMBER, Regensburg

Das *Gelasianum* (*Altgelasianum*) war lange Zeit nur durch eine einzige Vollhandschrift (Cod. Vat. Regin. lat. 316), die in der Mitte des 8. Jahrhunderts im Frankenreich (Kloster Chelles) entstanden ist, bekannt¹. Nun hat vor mehreren Jahren A. Dold einen weiteren Codex herausgegeben, der in seinem primären Textbestand, wie es im Vorwort heißt, ein „verkürztes und anders angelegtes *Altgelasianum*“ darstellt². Dieses sog. *Sacramentarium Pragense* (Sigel: Pr) stammt aus dem bayerischen Raum und wurde vor dem Jahre 794, vermutlich noch in den letzten Regierungsjahren des Herzogs Tassilo von Bayern (abgesetzt 788), in Regensburg geschrieben³.

In der Einleitung der Edition dieses Sakramentars hat sich Dold S. 44–70 ausführlich mit den Quellen dieses eigenartigen Meßbuches befaßt. Es stellt, wie bereits eingangs erwähnt, ein Gelasianum dar, das mit Formularen aus den *Gelasiana saec. VIII* (*Junggelasiana*)⁴ und einem, wie es scheint, *Gregorianum* bereichert ist. Unsere Frage geht im folgenden nach der Gestalt dieses *Gregorianums*.

¹ Vgl. zu dieser und den im folgenden zu nennenden Handschriften K. Gamber, *Codices liturgici latini antiquiores* (= *Spicilegium Friburgensis Subsidia*, Vol. 1, Freiburg/Schweiz 1963) (= CLLA) Nr. 610. Es gibt noch einige fränkische Fragmente des gleichen Typus; vgl. CLLA Nr. 611–615. Früher hat man die Entstehungszeit der Vollhandschrift 50–100 Jahre zu früh angesetzt, wodurch manche falsche Rückschlüsse über den Zeitpunkt der Einführung „römischer“ Liturgiebücher ins Frankenreich gezogen worden sind. Das *Altgelasianum* ist das „Meßbuch Pippins“ und nicht die *Gelasiana saec. VIII*; vgl. K. Gamber, Il Sacramentario di Paolo Diacono, in: *Rivista di Storia della Chiesa in Italia* 16 (1962) 417f.

² Herausgegeben von A. Dold – L. Eizenhöfer, *Das Prager Sakramentar*, Bd. I *Lichtbildausgabe* (Beuron 1944); Bd. II *Prolegomena und Textausgabe* (= *Texte und Arbeiten Heft 38/42*, Beuron 1949); vgl. CLLA Nr. 630.

³ Vgl. K. Gamber, Das Tassilo-Sakramentar. Das älteste erhaltene Regensburger Meßbuch, in: *Münchener Theol. Zeitschrift* 12 (1961) 205–209.

⁴ Vgl. K. Gamber, Il Sacramentario di Paolo Diacono a. a. O. 432f.

Dold hat bereits die Beobachtung gemacht, daß die gregorianischen Partien in Pr aus einem Codex stammen, der dem *Sakramentar von Padua* (Sigel: P) aus der Zeit um 840 nahesteht. Dieses wurde lange Zeit als ein *Gregorianum* angesehen, ist es aber nicht, sondern ein nach einem altertümlichen *Gregorianum* überarbeitetes *Junggelasianum*. Es wird gezeigt werden, daß diese Vorlage nicht direkt ein Meßbuch im Typus von P war, sondern ein Sakramentar, das älter ist als P, nämlich ein Meßbuch im Typus des *Sakramentars von Salzburg* (Sigel: Sal)¹. Dieses ist bald nach 800 im bayerisch-österreichischen Alpengebiet, offensichtlich nach einer Paduaner Vorlage, geschrieben.

Wie in der Ausgabe dieses Liturgiebuches nachgewiesen worden ist, unterscheidet sich Sal von P in der Hauptsache hinsichtlich seines Aufbaus, während der Formelbestand in P und Sal, von einem Mehr an Präfationen in Sal abgesehen, völlig gleich ist². Wir dürfen deshalb bei unserer Untersuchung anstelle des nur fragmentarisch überlieferten und als Meßbuchtypus zudem noch gekürzten Sal (es fehlen z. B. die Formulare für die Heiligenfeste ganz) den vollständig erhaltenen Codex P setzen. P selbst kann nicht eine der Vorlagen von Pr sein, da der Meßbuchtypus P erst kurz vor 800 ausgebildet worden ist, wie er auch nur in Handschriften aus der Mitte des 9. Jahrhunderts überliefert ist³.

In der folgenden Aufstellung bringen wir Formulare bzw. einzelne Formeln, die in Pr aus einem Liturgiebuch im Typus von Sal zur Ergänzung des gelasianischen Textbestandes genommen worden sind, wobei als Regel zu beobachten ist, daß, von einer einzigen Ausnahme abgesehen (Formular 162), niemals ein gelasianisches durch ein „gregorianisches“ Formular ersetzt erscheint.

Es sind dies in erster Linie die Heiligenfeste Pr 9 (Silvester), Pr 23 (Vincentius), Pr 113 (Vitalis), Pr 116 (Alexander), Pr 123 (Gordianus), Pr 137 (Nicomedes), Pr 162 (Abdon), Pr 166 (Feli-

¹ Herausgegeben von A. Dold - K. Gamber, Das Sakramentar von Salzburg. Seinem Typus nach auf Grund der erhaltenen Fragmente rekonstruiert, in seinem Verhältnis zum *Paduanum* untersucht (= Texte und Arbeiten, 4. Beiheft, Beuron 1960); CLLA Nr. 883.

² Vgl. Dold-Gamber a. a. O. 34–37.

³ Wahrscheinlich ist Paulinus von Aquileja († 802) der Redaktor von P; vgl. Dold-Gamber a. a. O. 35f. Es ist nur eine einzige Schwester-Handschrift zu P erhalten. Sie stammt vermutlich aus der Gegend von Trient; vgl. CLLA Nr. 890.

cissimus), Pr 169 (Cyriacus), Pr 177 (Timotheus), Pr 180 (Eusebius), Pr 181 (Sabina), Pr 186 (Protus), Pr 190 (Nicomedes), Pr 191 (Euplus), Pr 197 (Marcus), Pr 199 (Calistus), Pr 203 (Theodorus), Pr 205 (Martinus), Pr 207 (Mennas).

An Einzelformeln stammen aus Sal die Formeln Pr 45,3 (die Präfation am 1. Fastensonntag) = Sal 15, Pr 85 (die Palmweihe) = Sal 77 und Pr 86,3 (die Präfation am Palmsonntag) = Sal 80. Die beiden Präfationen sind, darauf ist besonders hinzuweisen, nur in Sal nachweisbar. Sie fehlen im jüngeren P. Mit P 337 (= Sal 130) stimmt weiterhin die Rubrik überein, die sich in Pr 101,1 a findet: *Secreta. Praefatio. Communicantes. Hanc igitur. omnia ut supra* und die aus dem *Urgregorianum* stammt¹. Als für den Sal-Typus charakteristisches Meßformular ist die mit *incipiunt orationes et missae dominicales cotidiana gregorii papae* überschriebene Werktagsmesse in Pr 232 anzusehen, die sich, mit fast der gleichen Überschrift, nur noch in P 849–852 (in Sal ist hier eine Lücke) findet. Auch das darauffolgende mit *Alia missa* überschriebene Formular Pr 233 zeigt in den Lesarten die typische Fassung von P und Sal. Mit P stimmen überein schließlich noch die Donnerstagssmessen der Fastenzeit in Pr, wenn sie auch in P um eine Woche verschoben eingetragen sind.

Die Sal-Vorlage wird nicht nur in der Vollhandschrift Pr deutlich, sie ist auch in den fragmentarisch erhaltenen Schwesterhandschriften zum Pr, nämlich CLLA Nr. 631, Nr. 632 und Nr. 635 zu erkennen, die wie Pr alle aus dem altbayerischen Raum (Regensburg-Freising) stammen. Von besonderer Bedeutung ist die Tatsache, daß in den genannten Fragmenten die Sal-Vorlage nicht in der gleichen Weise in Erscheinung tritt wie in Pr, d. h. es sind in den Fragmenten nicht die gleichen Formulare bzw. Formeln aus dieser entnommen wie dort. Das beweist aber, daß der Urtypus von Pr keine solchen Zusätze aus Sal aufgewiesen haben kann.

Untersuchen wir nun die Fragmente hinsichtlich ihres Bestandes an Sal-Formeln im einzelnen. In Fragment CLLA Nr. 631, einem gegen Ende des 8. Jahrhunderts möglicherweise in Regensburg geschriebenen Sakramentar, finden wir am Fest der Unschuldigen Kinder eine zusätzliche Präfation P 41 (= Sal 378). Die Präfation fehlt in Pr, während die übrigen Formeln des Fragments mit Pr übereinstimmen.

¹ Vgl. K. Gamber, *Wege zum Urgregorianum* (=Texte und Arbeiten Heft 46, Beuron 1956) 13.

Noch deutlicher tritt die Sal-Vorlage im Fragment CLLA Nr. 632 in Erscheinung, einem in der Zeit bald nach 800 in Freising geschriebenen Sakramentar. Hier geht der *Dominica in Quadragesima*, mit der hier allem Anschein nach das Kirchenjahr begonnen hat, ein *Commune* voraus, das dem *Commune* in P (in Sal nicht erhalten) entspricht. In Pr 223 ff. finden wir dagegen noch das ältere gelasianische *Commune*. Interessant ist auch hier das Formular der *Dominica in Quadragesima* selbst, weil hier im Gegensatz zu Pr die Sal-Präfation fehlt.

Der Sal-Einfluß macht sich ebenfalls im dritten Fragment, nämlich in CLLA Nr. 635, bemerkbar. Dieses aus 5 Blättern bestehende Bruchstück eines gegen Ende des 8. Jahrhunderts in Süddeutschland geschriebenen Sakramentars weist ähnlich wie Pr einige zusätzliche gregorianische Heiligenfeste auf, die aus einer Sal-Vorlage stammen, so *Adsumptio s. Mariae* und *Agapitus*, die in Pr entweder nicht gregorianisiert sind oder ganz fehlen, während andere gregorianische Heiligenfeste des Pr, so Nr. 177 (*Timotheus*), Nr. 180 (*Eusebius*) und Nr. 181 (*Sabina*) in diesem Sakramentar nicht vorkommen¹.

Was wurde nun durch unsere kurze Untersuchung in sakramentargeschichtlicher Hinsicht gewonnen? Einmal die Tatsache, daß in der Zeit des Bayernherzogs Tassilo im süddeutschen Raum ein Meßbuch in Gebrauch war, das dem Altgelasianum noch sehr nahe stand. Weiterhin, daß alle erhaltenen Vertreter dieses Typus eine Überarbeitung nach einem durch das Salzburger Sakramentar vertretenen Meßbuchtypus erkennen lassen, der in den einzelnen Handschriften jedoch in verschiedener Weise und in verschiedenem Grade in Erscheinung tritt. Daraus folgt aber, daß der Sal-Typus im bayerischen Raum gegen Ende des 8. Jahrhunderts weithin Eingang gefunden haben muß², wie er außer in Oberitalien (vgl. CLLA Nr. 881–882) auch im Bodenseegebiet durch mehrere Fragmente (vgl. CLLA Nr. 884–888) und im Salzburgischen Missionsgebiet (Pannonien) durch die sog. Kiewer Blätter (vgl. CLLA Nr. 895) nachgewiesen werden kann³.

¹ Hinsichtlich der ursprünglichen Ordnung der Blätter vgl. K. Gamber, *Sakramentartypen* (= Texte und Arbeiten, Heft 49/50, Beuron 1958) 77f.

² Auch in ein sehr frühes *Gregorianum*, das kurz nach 800 in Benediktbeuern geschrieben worden ist (CLLA Nr. 706) finden sich 3 Präfationen aus einem Meßbuch im Typus von Sal (Ben 1,3 = Sal 358, Ben 2,3 = Sal 362, Ben 6,3 = Sal 370) eingefügt.

³ Vgl. K. Gamber, *Die Kiewer Blätter in sakramentargeschichtlicher Sicht*, in: *Cyrillo-Methodiana* (Köln-Graz 1964) 362–371.

Die weite Verbreitung des Sal-Typus, von Oberitalien bis Regensburg, vom Bodensee bis nach Pannonien, erklärt sich durch die weite Ausdehnung des Patriarchates von Aquileja, das bis zu seiner Verkleinerung durch Karl d. Großen die genannten Gebiete umfaßt hat. Das Sakramenter von Salzburg ist, wie andernorts nachgewiesen, als das Meßbuch dieses Patriarchats zu betrachten.

The Eucharist in the Ignatian Epistles

S. M. GIBBARD S. S. J. E., Oxford

1. A summary of St. Ignatius' references to the eucharist

St. Ignatius of Antioch, though writing so early in the second century, shows five markedly 'catholic' emphases in his references to the eucharist. (At least they would have been called 'Catholic' with a capital C until very recently, when our present gales of ecumenical change began to blow!). But in some instances we must notice certain qualifications, which make his language less catholic than it would appear to be at first sight.

First, it is in sacrificial terms that Ignatius writes of the eucharist, linking it several times with the word *θυσιαστήρων*, altar or place of an altar (Eph. 5.2; Magn. 17.2; Philad. 4.1). But, to qualify this, we must note that he also calls his expected place of martyrdom at Rome an altar (Rom. 2.2).

Secondly, he applies the word 'eucharist' to the elements themselves at the Lord's supper and in a very 'realistic' way in Smyr. 7.1: "The eucharist is the flesh (*σάρξ*) of our Saviour Jesus Christ who suffered for our sins, which (*ἐν*) the Father raised up by his goodness": and Ignatius makes this point very strongly, when he says that the Docetists abstain from the eucharist, because they do not recognise in it the flesh of Christ; as equally they do not recognise the true flesh of Jesus in his life on earth and in his passion¹. But this catholic emphasis in Ignatius again needs to be qualified, because he uses the terms the flesh and blood of Jesus, not only of the eucharistic elements, but in wider senses to denote faith, love and the gospel: "Be renewed in faith, which is the flesh of the Lord and in love, which is the blood of Jesus Christ" (Trall. 8.1): "I found mercy, making the gospel my refuge

¹ On the nature of the false teaching combatted in these epistles, see E. Molland: art. in J. Eccl. Hist. 5, 1954, 1–6: this heresy may well be a development of that exposed in the New Testament in Colossians.

as the flesh of Jesus" (Philad. 5.1): "I desire his blood, which is incorruptible love" ἀγάπη ἀφθαρτος¹ (Rom. 7.3)².

Thirdly, Ignatius writes of the great power of the eucharist in the life of the Christian: he says in Eph. 20.2 that it is "the medicine of immortality, the antidote that we should not die, but live for ever in Jesus Christ": and in Ephes. 13 he seems to say that it is in the eucharist that "the powers of Satan are overthrown" and that "all warfare in heaven and on earth is made to cease".

Fourthly, he states in a thoroughly 'catholic' manner against the false teachers: "Let that be considered a valid eucharist (*βεβαῖα εὐχαριστία*) which is celebrated by the bishop, or by one whom he appoints" (Smyrn. 8.1). But here again a qualification needs to be made: it seems that it is not the mere authorisation by the bishop, which gives the eucharist its validity; still less is any enunciated doctrine of apostolic succession to be found in these epistles; but the presence of the bishop or his deputy ensures that the eucharist is a valid eucharist, because the bishop with his people constitute the true Christian community: "Unless a man be within the place of the altar, he lacks the bread of God, for if the prayer of one or two has such might, how much more has that of the bishop and of the whole church" (Rom. 5.2: cf. Smyrn. 8.2).

Fifthly, Ignatius often emphasises the corporate aspect of the eucharist: "Be careful therefore to use one eucharist, for there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one cup for union with his blood, one altar, as there is one bishop with the presbytery and the deacons my fellow servants" (Philad. 4: cf. Ephes. 5: 20.2: Magnes. 7.1–12).

¹ It is almost certain that ἀγάπη, as it is followed by ἀφθαρτος, should be taken literally as 'love' (So J. B. Lightfoot: Apost. Fathers, II 2, 227), and it seems unlikely that there is an allusion here to the Agape-feast, associated with the eucharist (as suggested by T. Zahn: Ignatius von Ant. 348: K. Lake: Apost. Fths. I 235 n. 1: F. L. Cirlot: Early Eucharist, 80: V. Corwin: St. Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch, 208).

² These three citations do not seem to have "une signification proprement eucharistique" (as is maintained by P. T. Camelot, O. P.: Ignace d'Antioche, 55: and also in art. Ign. d'Ant., Dict. Théol. Cath. VII 707): but rather, as J. B. Lightfoot maintains, "The reference here is not to the eucharist itself, but to the union with Christ, which is symbolized and pledged in the eucharist, . . . for Ignatius is here contemplating the consummation of his union with Christ through martyrdom" (Apost. Fths. II 2, 226).

2. Comparison between the Ignatian epistles and the New Testament

There is clearly a development in eucharistic doctrine since New Testament times, though most of these five marks are found in the New Testament, at least in embryo. First, nowhere are the words 'sacrifice' (*θυσία*) or 'altar' (*θυσιαστήριον*) used in the New Testament of the Lord's supper, with the just possible exception of Heb. 13.10 ("We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle"): but it must not be forgotten that Paul draws parallels both between the Lord's supper and Jewish sacrifices, and also between the Lord's supper and pagan sacrifices in 1 Cor. 10.18–22, to say nothing of the general sacrificial setting of the Last Supper in the Synoptic gospels.

Secondly nowhere in the New Testament are the bread and wine termed 'eucharist', nor are they described quite unambiguously and 'realistically' (so it seems to me) as the flesh and blood of Christ: The nearest approach to this is in John 6.56, "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood abideth in me and I in him"; although this is qualified both by more general language in 6.35, "I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall not hunger, and he that believeth on me shall never thirst", and also by the later words in 6.63, "It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words I have spoken unto you are spirit, and are life"¹.

Thirdly, there is no doubt that the New Testament recognised the power of the Lord's supper in the lives of Christians: but there is in the New Testament no language about the eucharist so strong as "the medicine of immortality" or "the overthrow of the powers of Satan".

¹ "The living bread or flesh is to the author of the gospel a comprehensive symbolical phrase containing a whole series of suggestions. . . . Fundamentally it suggests the Christ incarnate, offered as a sacrifice and finally glorified. It is then extended to embrace the regenerate believers who have been saved by the Christ. . . . These suggestions are all focused in the eucharist, which is not considered as a rite isolated or detached from Christian faith as a whole, but as the concretion of the Christ incarnate, sacrificed and glorified for the nourishment of the faithful". E. Hoskyns and F.N. Davey, Fourth Gospel, I 345.

"There may be ways of eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ in a spiritual manner which do not involve sacramental feeding. But the language (in John 6) is sacramental" J. H. Bernard, St. John. I, CLXIX: Dr. Bernard suggests that there may be anti-docetic polemic in John 6 as in the Ignatian epistles: op. cit., I, CLXVIII.

Fourthly, nowhere does the New Testament state explicitly that some authorised minister is necessary for a valid eucharist.

Nor fifthly is the corporate aspect of the Lord's supper so strongly stressed in the New Testament except in 1 Cor. 10.17, "Seeing that we, who are many, are one bread, one body: for we all partake of the one bread".

3. Causes for this development in eucharistic theology

At least three causes have been suggested on the human level for this development.

First, some scholars have attributed it to the influence on Ignatius of the pagan mystery-religions. Their arguments seem to involve special pleading. For example, H. W. Bartsch¹ maintains that, while Paul borrowed words from the mystery-religions in a general sense, Ignatius used the concepts of the mystery-religions in a real cultic and almost magical sense. Here are two examples of the contentions of scholars who maintain this position. First, Bartsch claims to find in Polyc. 7.1 a reference to the believer sharing in the dying of the divine redeemer in the eucharist, in order to attain to the new life of the resurrection as in the mystery-religions: but there is clearly no explicit reference in this passage to the eucharist: moreover Bartsch's rendering here, "If I may attain through the suffering of God" for *εάνπερ διὰ τοῦ παθεῖν θεοῦ ἐπιτύχω* seems far less likely than "If I through my sufferings may attain to God", because in these epistles the phrase *θεοῦ ἐπιτυχεῖν* often means to "attain to God": the passage seems to refer not to the eucharist but to Ignatius' coming martyrdom; he writes to Polycarp, "If I through my sufferings may attain to God, I shall be found your disciple at the resurrection".

Secondly, Bartsch seems to be guilty of similar special pleading when he finds the mystery-religion concept of the eucharist in Smyrn. 7.1, "They (i. e., Docetists), who deny the gift of God (i. e., in the eucharist), are perishing in their disputes: but it were better for them to love (*ἀγαπᾶν*) that they also might attain to the Resurrection". Bartsch interprets the infinitive *ἀγαπᾶν* not as "to love" but "to hold an agape", a love-feast in connection

¹ H. W. Bartsch: *Gnostisches Gut und Gemeindetradition bei Ignatius von Antiochien*, 99–117.

with the eucharist, where as he maintains in the previous citation “the participants attain not to the resurrection life”¹. But it is far more likely that ἀγαπᾶν has its normal meaning “to love”² for two reasons: first, in the previous chapter Ignatius has been castigating the Docetists for their lack of love to the widows and orphans, the needy and the oppressed; and secondly, in the following chapter he uses for holding an agape the more obvious phrase ἀγάπην ποιεῖν and not this single infinitive ἀγαπᾶν.

So the argument that the heightening of the eucharistic theology was due to the influence of mystery-religions seems quite unproven.

A second possible explanation of this development has been found in the personality of Ignatius himself. He writes about almost everything in an impassioned way: for example, about his expected martyrdom in Rome he writes begging the Christians there to do nothing to prevent him from being “ground by the teeth of wild beasts” that he may be found to be the pure bread of Christ (Rom. 4.1). Similarly Ignatius wrote passionately about monepiscopacy, indeed so passionately that Canon B. H. Streeter in his book, *The Primitive Church* (pp. 163–178), wrote all this off, though perhaps not entirely convincingly, as the ‘idée fixe’ of a somewhat neurotic bishop. So Ignatius’ passionate style of writing may have had something to do with this ‘stepping up’ of his exposition of the eucharist.

But a third, and more likely, explanation is that the false teaching and schismatic spirit of the Docetists drew out of Ignatius these catholic emphases. If the Docetists denied the real flesh of the Incarnate Lord, then let the faithful reflect more deeply on the real flesh of Christ in the eucharist. This would of course only make more explicit what was already in New Testament tradition. Again if the Docetists were breaking up the unity of the church, then let the faithful reflect more deeply on the unity given to the church in the eucharist: “Hasten all to come together as to one temple of God, as to one altar, to one Jesus Christ, who came forth from the one Father, and is with one and departed to one” (Magn. 7.2).

In this sense the heretics are the elucidators, if not the formulators, of the doctrines of the church.

¹ So also R. Bultmann: *Theology of New Testament*, I 144: and G. Baraillé: art. Ign. d'Ant., *Dict. Théol. Cath.* VII 708.

² So P. T. Camelot, O. P.: *Ignace d'Antioche*, 160, n. 3.

Pre-Baptismal Rites in Chrysostom's Baptismal Catecheses

P. W. HARKINS, Cincinnati

On October 25, 1955, Père Antoine Wenger was examining some dozen MSS. of Chrysostom belonging to the monastery of Stavronikita on Mount Athos. As he leafed through Codex 6 of this collection he realized that he had made a momentous discovery. Even where the contents of this eleventh-century MS. duplicate sermons of the Mouth of Gold already published, its value is beyond question; where it preserves sermons hitherto unknown, its value becomes unique. Such is the case with the series of eight baptismal catecheses contained in this codex and published by Wenger as Volume 50 of *Sources chrétiennes*¹.

Hitherto very little had been known of this aspect of Chrysostom's pastoral activity. Montfaucon had published two instructions which he called *Catechesis prima et altera ad illuminandos*² and, indeed, they are a first and second but they do not belong to the same series. The second belongs to a series which is otherwise lost; the first is duplicated in a MS. homiliary of the Synodal Library of Moscow as the first of a series of four. Papadopoulos-Kerameus published the last three of these in an obscure collection of Greek theological texts which has remained practically unknown to the western world³. Not only does the first of Papadopoulos duplicate the first of Montfaucon but his fourth is identical with the third in the new series from Stavronikita. This duplicate, incidentally, is the Greek original of the

¹ A. Wenger, Jean Chrysostome: *Huit catéchèses baptismales inédites* (Paris 1957). Much that I shall say stems from this excellent volume.

² Reprinted by J. P. Migne in his *Patrologiae cursus completus: series graeca* (PG) 49 (Paris 1863), cols. 221–240.

³ A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Varia graeca sacra* (St. Petersburg 1909). So learned and indefatigable a scholar as Dom Chrysostom Baur makes no mention of it in his *John Chrysostom and his Time*. Eng. tr. Sister M. Gonzaga, R. S. M. (Westminster, Md. 1960–1961).

Sermo ad Neophytes which has been published many times in the Latin editions of Chrysostom's works.

Hence we now possess, in all, twelve baptismal instructions of Chrysostom¹. Six of these are addressed *Ad illuminandos* and six *Ad illuminatos*: the first two of the Stavronikita series, the first three of Papadopoulos, and the isolated second of Montfaucon contain instructions for the catechumens; the third of Stavronikita (which is Papadopoulos' fourth) salutes the neophytes on Easter, while the remaining five of the Stavronikita series exhort the newly baptized to keep their baptismal robes unwrinkled and without stain.

Although all these sermons offer many interesting problems, this study will confine itself to the six instructions addressed to the catechumens. From these it will study the sequence, purpose, and symbolism of the pre-baptismal liturgy as practiced at Antioch toward the close of the fourth century with its special emphasis on the conflict with Satan. When possible the words will be those of Chrysostom himself, drawn directly or adapted from his instructions to the catechumens and, occasionally, from his other works; the mystagogical sermons of Cyril of Jerusalem and Theodore of Mopsuestia² will be cited where pertinent; some actual rubrics and formulas will be supplied from the *Euchologion* found in an eighth-century Barberini codex³. Particularly useful for the ritual of apotaxis and syntaxis is a fifth- or sixth-century *Ordo* from Constantinople⁴. The *Peregrinatio Etheriae* will furnish some specific details⁵.

¹ I have recently published an English translation of all twelve, together with a commentary, in St. John Chrysostom: Baptismal Instructions (Westminster, Md. 1963) which is Vol. 31 of the Ancient Christian Writers series. All references to the catecheses will be made to this edition (as ACW 31).

² The best edition of Cyril's mystagogical catecheses is found in J. Quasten, *Monumenta eucharistica et liturgica vetustissima* (Bonn 1935) but they are more readily available in the text and commentary of A. Touttée published in PG 33. Theodore's baptismal discourses, preserved only in a Syriac translation, have been published by A. Mingana in *Woodbrooke Studies* 5 and 6 (Cambridge 1932 and 1933) but are more accessible in the edition of R. Tonneau and R. Devreesse, which appeared as Vol. 145 of *Studi e testi* (Vatican City 1949). This will be referred to as SeT.

³ Published in F. C. Conybeare and A. J. Maclean, *Rituale Armenorum* (Oxford 1905), pp. 389 ff.

⁴ Also published in *Rituale Armenorum* (pp. 438–442) but found in a somewhat fuller form in a Vatican MS. (Ottobon. graec. 175).

⁵ This has been published by H. Pétré as Vol. 21 of *Sources chrétiennes*. These other sources are introduced only *ad complementum doctrinae*. Chry-

I shall treat first of the enrollment of the catechumens and their sponsors; I shall then discuss three pre-baptismal rites: the exorcisms, the renouncement of Satan and covenant with Christ, and finally the anointing of the candidates for baptism.

I

Enrollment and Sponsors

There were three kinds of catechumens. It would seem, first, that the Church considered children of Christian parents as catechumens, and that they would immediately be admitted among the candidates for baptism if they expressed a desire to receive the sacrament¹. More properly, however, the catechumens were those who asked to be registered on the official list, although often enough this registration merely signified a wish to receive clinical baptism at the hour of death². But only those could be called catechumens in the fullest sense who had not only registered but also had been enrolled together with their sponsors in the "book of the church", as Theodore of Mopsuestia tells us³. The enrolled would then attend special instructions and mystagogical discourses during a thirty-day preparation⁴ to receive the sacrament at Easter.

Chrysostom seems to support this distinction between registered and enrolled catechumens when he distinguishes two classes of uninitiated. All catechumens are uninitiated⁵, but that

sostom has not left us an official *Ordo* of the rites; such rubrics as he does give are often given indirectly or in skeletal form. In introducing these other sources I am not implying that the churches of Antioch, Constantinople, Jerusalem, and Mopsuestia used identical forms in initiating the candidates. But there was one faith, one Lord, and one baptism, and the rituals employed in the different churches were substantially the same.

¹ See Baur 1, p. 81, who cites Probst, *Katechese und Predigt vom Anfang des vierten bis zum Ende des sechsten Jahrhunderts* (Breslau 1884), p. 42; also ACW 31, p. 290.

² This was an abuse against which Chrysostom constantly fought; he denounced such conduct as senseless because of the uncertainty of receiving the sacrament in time and the loss of so many benefits even if it was received at the last moment. See, e. g., Instruction 9,5–8 (ACW 31, pp. 133–134, 291), In Joh. 18 (PG 59.115), and In act. apost. 1 (*ibid.* 60.23–25).

³ SeT, pp. 347–349.

⁴ See ACW 31, pp. 132, 141, 288, 290, 300, 310, 323, 324.

⁵ Instruction 10, 18 (ACW 31, pp. 155–156).

some of the uninitiated are excluded from the mystagogical discourses becomes clear when he says to the candidates for baptism:

I shall speak to you of it [i. e. faith] at another time, when many of the uninitiated will be present. But what you alone must hear now and what cannot be told to you when the uninitiated are mingled together with you, these things I must tell you today¹.

And he goes on to explain the renouncement of Satan and the covenant with Christ. We must conclude that Chrysostom here means by the uninitiated those catechumens who were not proximately preparing for baptism, and that they were excluded at least from the mystagogical discourses. The enrolled were *οἱ μέλλοντες φωτίζεσθαι, illuminandi*; the other uninitiates were not.

In such large centers as Antioch and Constantinople it was impossible for the clergy to know the moral dispositions of each candidate among the vast throngs which would ask for baptism. Hence there arose the custom of having sponsors to vouch for those requesting enrollment. Theodore of Mopsuestia testifies to this practice and he is at pains to show that the sponsor played an important part in the initiation. Not only does the sponsor answer for the moral fitness of his candidate but he also assists him in some of the sacramental ceremonies. The candidate is still an alien to the heavenly Jerusalem and when he enrolls for citizenship therein he must have a sponsor who conducts him to the duly appointed registrar of baptisms and testifies that he is worthy of citizenship.

The sponsor, who is called godfather, also guarantees that he will guide the candidate who is not yet versed in the life of the city or in how to conduct himself in it. He testifies to what the catechumen has done and to the fact that he has prepared himself in the past so as to be worthy of the city and its citizenship. Since enrollment in any city requires registration, the candidate's name is inscribed in the church register together with that of his godfather who answers for him and becomes his guide in the city and the sponsor for his citizenship. This is all done so that the candidate may know long beforehand and while still on earth that he is enrolled in the heavenly Jerusalem².

¹ Instruction 11, 18 (op. cit., pp. 166 and 319, n. 44).

² SeT, pp. 345-349.

Theodore also describes the candidate's posture when he is being enrolled. He is instructed to hold out his arms, as in prayer, and to keep his eyes cast down – the attitude of an accused person before the court. He is to remove his outer garment and stand barefoot on sackcloth¹. The Barberini *Euchologion* states that at the ceremony of enrollment the priest removes the candidate's garment and shoes and faces him to the west; he breathes upon him thrice and makes the sign of the cross on the candidate's forehead, mouth, and breast, and then prays over him, saying: "In Thy name, O God, and in the name of Thy only-begotten Son, and of Thy Holy Spirit, I place my hand on this Thy servant who has been deemed worthy to flee to Thy holy name and to find protection under the shelter of Thy wings"².

Theodore also tells us that, at a later stage in the preliminaries, after the ritual of the renouncement of Satan and the covenant with Christ, when the priest signs the candidate with chrism in the sign of the cross, the godfather stands behind the kneeling catechumen, covers the crown of his head with a linen stole and assists him to his feet³.

Chrysostom makes no direct mention of the enrollment. However we can be sure that it was practiced at Antioch since he frequently addresses the catechumens as those who have been enrolled in the army of Christ⁴. It is also sure that sponsors were customary at Antioch because at one point in the *Catecheses* Chrysostom turns and addresses them⁵. In fact he calls them *ἀναδεχόμενοι*, those who receive, a name which may well be a counterpart to Tertullian's term for the newly baptized, *suscepti*⁶, which could mean that the sponsors received the newly baptized as they emerged from the baptismal waters.

But Chrysostom suggests another interpretation borrowed from commerce and the law. Those who go surety (*ἀναδεχόμενοι*)

¹ Op. cit., p. 361. See also J. Quasten, "Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Exorcism of Cilicum", Harvard Theological Review 35, 1942, 209–219, who shows this same use of sackcloth in Spain and Africa. There is no hint of it in either Cyril or Chrysostom.

² *Rituale Armenorum*, pp. 390–391.

³ SeT, p. 395.

⁴ Instruction 1, *passim*. In Instruction 2,9 (ACW 31, p. 46) he does address all "who have deserved to be enrolled in this heavenly book", which may well be a reference to the catechumen's enrollment in the register of the church.

⁵ Instruction 2,15–16 (ACW 31, pp. 48–49).

⁶ Ibid. p. 221, n. 34.

take a greater risk than the one who borrows money because they make themselves liable for the whole sum. The sureties in baptism must be more alert than the sureties in law and must show their paternal love by encouraging, counselling and correcting those for whom they go surety. The obligation assumed by these spiritual fathers toward their spiritual sons is a grave one and no slight danger hangs over their heads if they are remiss.

Chrysostom turns to address the sponsors right after a brief discussion of exorcism and just before he treats of the renouncement of Satan and covenant with Christ. This may well imply that the sponsors were present at and participated in these rituals. He also cautions them to show great affection to those they sponsor in the matter of spiritual instruction. Certainly the sponsors were present at the mystagogical discourses and probably also at the various instructions. The *Peregrinatio Etheriae* testifies that such was the case at Jerusalem¹ where, after the exorcism every morning, an instruction was given by the bishop around whom sat in a circle the catechumens and their sponsors. Although Chrysostom is not so specific, his address to the sponsors shows their importance, and it is not unlikely that they played a prominent part in the ritual at Antioch.

After his enrollment in the register of the *illuminandi*, the catechumen followed all the Lenten exercises: rigorous fasting, daily instructions, and catechetical sermons. Let us now see what Chrysostom's catechetical discourses have to tell us about the three pre-baptismal rites of exorcism, the renouncement of Satan and covenant with Christ, and, finally, of the anointing of the candidates for baptism.

II

The Exorcisms

Chrysostom's *Catecheses* do not provide us with an *ordo* or *rituale*. He is not primarily a liturgist in these discourses, but a pastor of souls. Just as his scriptural exegesis is never far removed from instruction in morality and exhortation to the life of virtue, so, too, his explanation of the pre-baptismal ritual is more concerned with the purpose and symbolism of the rites by which

¹ See Pétré, *Ethéria*, pp. 257, 259.

the illuminand is freed from the power of Satan and becomes a true soldier and athlete of Christ. His treatment of the symbolism of the exorcisms reflects the central theme underlying the pre-baptismal ritual, the conflict with Satan.

Hence it comes as no surprise that Chrysostom nowhere records the formula of exorcism even if he frequently refers to the exorcist's "awesome words". The same is true of Etheria, Theodore and Cyril; we do not find the exact formula in their works¹, although they do give us some interesting information about the practices of Jerusalem and Mopsuestia. The *Peregrinatio*, for example, tells us that in fourth-century Jerusalem the custom was for the catechumens to come to the church daily at Prime; the first order of the day was for the candidates for baptism to be exorcised by the clerics². Theodore shows us the catechumen standing silent on sackcloth (to remind him of his own and his fathers' sins) while the exorcist, acting as his advocate, pleads his cause³.

Cyril is a rich source of information on exorcism. He tells us that the candidates were exorcised frequently during Lent and that their faces were veiled after each exorcism which is a sign of their purification. He does not specify the formula, but he tells us that it consisted of phrases from the Scriptures which invoked the name of God and the Crucified and which rebuked the demon. To put the demons to flight the candidates were signed with the

¹ It may be in place to record here a formula found in the Barberini *Euchologion*: "God the holy one, whom we regard with terror and hold in high esteem, incomprehensible in all His works and strength, inscrutable, has predestined thee, O Satan, for the vengeance of eternal punishment. Through us, His worthless servants, He bids thee and every power that works with thee to stand aloof from those who have just been signed [with the sign of the cross] in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, our true God. I adjure thee, then, O all-wicked, unclean, defiled, loathsome, and hostile spirit, (I adjure thee) by the might of Jesus Christ, who has all power in heaven and on earth, . . . go forth and depart from those who are being prepared for holy baptism. I adjure thee by the saving passion of our Lord Jesus Christ and by the price of His body and blood and by His dread advent; for He shall come upon the clouds . . . judging all the earth and condemning thee and the power that works together with thee to the gehenna of fire, handing thee over to the external darkness where the worm never sleeps and the fire is never quenched." See *Rituale Armenorum*, pp. 392–393. The same *Euchologion* records two other formulas (*ibid.*, pp. 391–392, 394).

² See Pétré, *Ethérie*, p. 257.

³ SeT, p. 361.

sign of the cross. Insufflations (on the face and into the ears) were used to signify the power of the Holy Spirit, the ejection of the demon, and the removal of sin. But to prevent anyone from thinking that the demon is completely routed by these exorcisms or that the soul is freed from its sins before the actual reception of baptism, Cyril repeatedly teaches that we die and are released from our sins only in the waters of regeneration¹. He tells us further that the dread formula speaks not only of Christ, our Master, but of punishment, vengeance, and the fires of hell. Chrysostom, too, tells us that at Antioch, after the daily instruction, the candidates were sent along to bear the "awesome words" of the exorcists who have been appointed to this task². But he is more concerned with explaining to the candidates why they are sent along to the exorcists naked and unshod; he is more eager to set forth the aim and purpose of the ritual by which the candidates are freed from the domination of Satan and come under the yoke of Christ.

And why are the catechumens sent along to the exorcists naked and unshod³? This is the season of the King's victory. He has conquered in the battle; He has taken captives, and captives go naked and unshod. The catechumens are reminded by their appearance that Satan held sway over them; now they stand with hands upturned to confess God's future sovereignty. They

¹ The information from Cyril is summarized in a lengthy and valuable note to his *Procatechesis* by A. Trottée in PG 33, 347B–348B. See also ACW 31, pp. 217–219. It should be noted that Cyril, as does Chrysostom, also attributes the remission of sin to other causes such as conversion in one's way of life, confession of one's sins, fasting, the renunciation of Satan, the exorcised oil wherewith the body was anointed before immersion in the waters, and, finally, to the grace of the Holy Spirit who comes to dwell in the soul after baptism. Just as this grace perfects the remission of sins given in baptism, so do exorcisms and the other things just mentioned dispose the soul in various ways to receive this grace.

² Instruction 2, 12 (ACW 31, p. 47). It is not clear who the ministers of exorcism were. Trottée (PG 33, 348) feels that the catechumens were ordinarily exorcised by priests, sometimes by deacons; Etheria states that they were clerics (Pétré, *Ethérerie*, p. 257); Wenger (*op. cit.*, p. 78) considers that "those appointed to this task" implies an ordination, and that the exorcists belonged to an ecclesiastical *taxis* or rank of the clergy ordained for this function. See also ACW 31, p. 227, n. 59.

³ Instruction 10, 14 (ACW 31, p. 154). In 9, 11 (*ibid.*, p. 135) Chrysostom says: And why, after we have instructed you, do they remove your sandals and clothes and send you along barefoot and naked, except for a single short garment, to hear the exorcists' words?

are the spoils and booty of war; they are in captivity, but a captivity which changes slavery into freedom, which leads the captive to his true homeland and the common mother of us all, the Church, where he will be a fellow-citizen with the saints¹.

But why does the dread formula of exorcism speak not only of Christ, our Master, but of punishment, vengeance, and the fires of hell? Because the demon is shameless and the catechumen helpless. The catechumen is a sheep without a seal (*σφραγίς*)²; he is a deserted inn and a hostel without a door; he is a lair for robbers, a refuge for wild beasts, a dwelling place for demons. But the Master has decreed that this deserted, doorless inn, this robber's refuge should become a royal palace. Hence the need for teachers and exorcists. The teachers, by their instruction, will make strong and secure the walls of the inn which were weak and unsound; the exorcists will make sure by those awesome words that no wild beast lurks within the catechumen, no serpent, no viper, no scorpion³.

Hence this rite is not performed without aim or purpose. The exorcists prepare the catechumen to receive the King of heaven to dwell within him by cleansing his mind with those awesome words which put to flight every device of the wicked one and make the catechumen's heart worthy of the royal presence. Along with this, Chrysostom says, the rite itself impresses great piety on the soul and leads it to abundant contrition. Those who endure captivity of the body show by their posture their dejection at the disaster which has overcome them. So, too, when the devil's captives are about to be set free from his domination and to come under the yoke of goodness, they remind themselves of their former servitude by the show of bare feet and outstretched hands. They do this that they may know from what evil they are being delivered and to what good they are hurrying, and that this very knowledge may be the foundation for greater gratitude and may make their souls even more than well-disposed for baptism⁴.

The ritual in Chrysostom's day consisted, then, of the dread and awesome words of exorcism calculated to put to flight the

¹ Ibid.

² The seal is a sign of ownership and a guarantee of protection as we are told by Gregory of Nazianzus (PG 36. 364A) and by Didymus the Blind (PG 39. 717B). See also F. J. Dölger, *Sphragis* (Paderborn 1911), pp. 175–179.

³ ACW 31, p. 155.

⁴ Instruction 2, 12–14 (ibid., p. 48).

worst of demons; the formula invoked Christ and spoke of punishment, vengeance, and the fires of hell. The effects of exorcism were to cleanse the mind, to make the heart contrite, and to rout the demons while preparing the soul to receive its King and Master.

III

Apotaxis and Syntaxis

The second ceremony which emphasizes the conflict with the adversary is the ritual of renouncement of Satan and the covenant with Christ¹. To give to this rite the great importance which it merits it seems that at Antioch, in Chrysostom's day, the time for the renouncement and attachment had been moved up from Saturday, immediately before baptism, to Friday at the ninth hour². This allowed the priests to ask the questions individually even of a large number of catechumens³.

Chrysostom sees a significant symbolism in the choice of this hour. On Friday, at the ninth hour, he says to the catechumens, you must have certain questions asked of you and you must present your contracts to the Master. . . . For on Friday at the ninth hour, the thief entered Paradise, the darkness . . . was dissolved, and the Light which was perceived by both body and mind was taken up as a sacrifice for the whole world. For at that hour Christ said: Father, into Thy hands I commend My spirit (Lk 23,46). Then, the sun we see looked on the Sun of Justice shining from the cross and turned back its own rays⁴.

¹ Wenger (*op. cit.*, p. 82) feels that, according to Chrysostom, this rite could not be omitted even in cases of clinical baptism. Certainly the full fruit of the sacrament was not forthcoming for a comatose recipient. What benefit does the baptized get from his initiation, Chrysostom asks (ACW 31, p. 134), when he lies unconscious, inert as a log or stone or corpse, when he does not recognize those who are present, nor hear what they say, when he cannot make the responses by which he will enter into the blessed covenant with our common Master?

² So, at least, in Instruction 11, 19 (ACW 31, p. 166), but see my note *ibid.*, pp. 221–222.

³ Theodore (SeT, p. 373) hints at what Chrysostom states explicitly, namely, that the candidates are asked for their contracts one by one (ACW 31, p. 50); in the *Ordo* of Constantinople, the bishop asks the questions of the candidates in a group.

⁴ Instruction 11, 19 (ACW 31, p. 166).

In Theodore of Mopsuestia this rite seems to occur immediately before baptism. The ritual on which he comments reads: Again you stand on haircloth, unshod, your outer garment removed, your hands stretched out to God in the posture of prayer. At first, on your knees; you fall on your knees but the rest of your body is straight. Then you say, "I renounce Satan, all his angels, all his works, all his service, all his vanity, and all his worldly error; and I bind myself by vow, I believe, and I am baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit"¹.

The *Ordo* of Constantinople is more explicit². The bishop here bids the catechumens to stand in fear and be signed [with the sign of the cross]; he further orders them to remove their garments and shoes and says: "This is the end of your instruction; the time of your baptism is at hand. Today you are going to make the contract of faith with Christ. . . . Tomorrow night you are going to die to sin; now make your will and make your renunciation be your last testament; write down the devil as heir to your sin." He then tells them: ". . . Lift up your hands as if the angels are searching you to find out if anything belonging to the devil is hidden on your person. . . . Stand like captives for it is as such that Christ buys you. Breathe upon the devil as you look on him and hate him." If the catechumen still has anything of the adversary in him, the bishop cautions him to spit it out as he breathes upon the devil.

Then, in a brief instruction, the bishop tells the catechumens that the devil is furious because they have deserted him but does not believe that they are truly saved. "Hence", says the bishop, "Christ makes you stand before Satan that you may renounce him, breathe upon him, and take up the conflict against him. The devil stands facing the west because there lies the source of darkness. Renounce him and breathe upon him." After they have breathed upon the devil, the bishop says: "Turn now to the east and attach yourselves to Christ. . . . Stand in fear for all things here are formidable and frightening. All the powers of heaven are here. . . . the cherubim and seraphim are writing down your words; they are leaning down from heaven, now, to receive your contracts and take them to the Master."

¹ SeT, p. 369.

² A text of this *Ordo* is published in *Rituale Armenorum*, pp. 438-442.

The bishop next bids the catechumens to repeat after him the formula: "I renounce Satan, and all his works, and all service to him, and all his angels, and all his pomps." He says this three times with all answering and then three times he asks them: "Do you renounce Satan?" Three times they reply: "We do renounce him." Again they are told to breathe upon the devil. Next the bishop says to them: "Turn to the west and hold your hands down. Stand in fear and repeat after me: I enter into the service of Christ and I believe in one God, the Father Almighty", and so forth in the formula of the Nicene Creed.

All repeat the Creed thrice. He then asks three times the question: "Do you enter into the service of Christ?" And three times they answer: "We do enter into His service." Then he bids them to adore Christ and goes on to say: "Behold you have renounced the devil and entered into the service of Christ. The contract is made. The Lord holds it in heaven. Look to your covenant and guard it for it is produced on the day of judgment. . . . Did you renounce the devil? Hate him to the very end. Did you enter into Christ's service? Glorify Him to your last breath. Go to your death with this orthodox confession of the Lord God, and suffer no shipwreck of your faith. . . . From now on your enemy is watching what you say and think, how you reason and move, and what you do. Be, therefore, on your guard that he may have nothing ill to say of you on the terrible day of judgment."

After prayers for the Church and all the faithful, the bishop blesses the congregation and bids the catechumens to clothe themselves, and put on their shoes. A deacon then says: "As many as have come for baptism, come forward for the imposition of hands and to receive the blessing." The bishop lays his hands on all of them, men and women, and advances to the holy table and says: "You are our illumination and to you do we give glory and to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, now and always, for ever and ever." And the people say: "Amen."

Many of these purposes and much of this symbolism are echoed in Chrysostom. In worldly affairs, he says, whenever someone wishes to entrust his business to someone, a written contract must be completed between the trustee and his client. The same is true when the Master is going to entrust to the catechumen not mortal things which are subject to death and destruction, but spiritual things which belong to eternity. Wherefore this contract is called faith, since it possesses nothing visible but only

things which can be seen by the eyes of the spirit. However, it is not written on paper with ink; it is written in God by the Spirit. The words uttered are registered in heaven and the agreement abides indelibly with the Master¹.

When you have all entered the church, Chrysostom says to the catechumens, then must you all together bend your knee and not stand erect²; you must stretch your hands to heaven and thank God for this gift. Sacred custom bids you to remain on your knees so as to acknowledge His supreme rule even by your posture, for to bend the knee is a mark of those who acknowledge their servitude. Your posture will remind you from what evil you are delivered and to what good you will dedicate yourselves. Then, the priest³ comes to you one by one, asks for your contract and confession, and prepares you to utter those awesome and frightening words: "I renounce thee, Satan, thy pomps, thy service, and thy works." The words are few but their power is great. The invisible powers rejoice at your conversion, receive the words from your tongue, and carry them up to the Master. There they are inscribed in the books of heaven⁴.

Chrysostom merely expresses the formula without explaining it. That this is the Antiochene formula is made clear by two other catecheses, although neither gives the formula in full. In Instruction 11,22 the candidate is bidden to speak these words: "I renounce thee, Satan"; Instruction 12,48 adds: "and thy pomps and thy service"⁵. In the sixth homily of his *Commentary on Colossians*⁶, Chrysostom substitutes "and thy angels" for "and all thy works", but this is probably the formula used in Constantinople since this sermon was delivered in the capital

¹ Instruction 2, 17 (ACW 31, p. 50).

² Instruction 11, 21 (ibid. 167). The kneeling posture and upstretched hands are also mentioned in Instruction 2, 18 and by Theodore who states that the initiand first stands on sackcloth while his outer garment is removed. Then he kneels but holds the rest of his body erect and looks toward heaven (SeT, pp. 369–373).

³ The candidates were led in by the priests, but it is the priest who asks for their contract and confession. The priest would in all probability be the bishop, as is the case in the *Ordo of Constantinople*. Theodore specifies that those who prepare the candidates to recite the words are deacons (SeT, p. 373).

⁴ Instruction 2,18–20 (ACW 31, pp. 50–51).

⁵ Ibid., pp. 167, 188.

⁶ PG 62, 342C.

city of the Empire. Proclus may be giving the full Constantinopolitan formula when he mentions both the works and the angels of Satan in an unedited catechesis preserved in an uncial MS. of the eighth or ninth century¹. The formula is still more developed in Theodore, where one reads: "I renounce Satan and all his angels, and all his service, and all his vanity, and all his worldly glamor."² In Cyril the formula reads: "I renounce thee, Satan, and all thy works, and all thy pomps, and all thy service."³

And what are the pomps of Satan? Every form of sin, the spectacles of the theatre and the hippodrome, abusive language, tokens, amulets, and magic. But the cross has the strength of a marvellous amulet and a mighty incantation. Blessed is the soul which speaks the name of Jesus Christ Crucified. Call upon that name and every disease will flee, every assault of Satan will yield⁴.

The ritual is not complete with the renunciation of Satan; the candidate must also make his covenant with Christ. By the words of renunciation the catechumen rebels against his old adversary and master. But where does he get the boldness to rebel? What weapons does he have? What ally? "I enter into Thy service, O Christ", says the catechumen. "Hence I am bold and rebel. For I have a strong place of refuge and this has made me superior to the demon, although heretofore I was trembling and afraid."⁵

This adherence to Christ is not only an act of faith but a commitment for life⁶, and this is symbolized by the candidate's

¹ *Sinaiticus graecus* 491. This MS. has been described by A. Wenger in *L'Assomption de la t. s. Vierge dans la tradition byzantine du VI^e au X^e siècle. Etudes et documents* (Paris 1955), pp. 96–99.

² SeT, p. 367. ³ PG 33. 1068 C. See ACW 31, p. 168.

⁴ Ibid. Chrysostom's catalogue of Satan's pomps (see also ibid., pp. 189 223) is quite similar to that of both Theodore (SeT, p. 389) and Cyril (PG 33. 1069C–1071A). Cyril's list, however, includes foods and things made unclean by the invocation of impure demons. J. Daniélou, S. J., in his *The Bible and the Liturgy* (Notre Dame, Ind. 1956), pp. 26, 28–29, notes that the renunciation of Satan seems to be directly connected with the renunciation of idolatry and, hence, that this ritual must have originated in the Christianity of the missions rather than with the Jewish converts. This would explain why the images of the rite and the sins which constitute the pomps are more closely connected with paganism than with Judaism.

⁵ *Instruction* 11, 24 (ACW 31, p. 168).

⁶ See Daniélou, *Bible and Liturgy*, p. 33.

orientation. Although we find no mention of it in either Theodore or Chrysostom, it seems most likely that the candidate turned to the west to renounce Satan and to the east to make his pledge to Christ. Cyril is very specific on this point as is also the *Ordo* of Constantinople¹.

By this contract we are no longer slaves of Satan but slaves of Christ. He buys us as we would buy slaves only after we ask if they be willing to serve us. When He is about to take us into His service, He first asks if we are willing to put away our old master, the devil, and then accepts our compact. He does not force His mastership on us. But we would never buy reckless or lawless slaves. Christ does, and pays the top price – the price of His own blood. Even if we be wicked slaves, He is satisfied if we say from the heart: "I renounce thee, Satan." If we do this, He has received all that He asks². But the catechumen is more than a servant and slave. He is the bride, and Christ the Bridegroom. Instead of a dowry let the catechumen contribute the words of renunciation and attachment, and Christ will consider this as great wealth. For He is rich towards all and for all who call upon Him (Rom. 10.12)³.

Neither Chrysostom nor Theodore include in the ceremony of renouncement and attachment the formula of the Creed which we find in full in the *Ordo* from Constantinople and in an abbreviated form in Cyril of Jerusalem. This raises the question: When did the *redditio symboli* take place? In Cyril's day Jerusalem had the custom of delivering the Symbol at the beginning of Lent, explaining its various articles throughout the holy season, and receiving it at various times but especially after the covenant with Christ⁴. The ritual of Theodore requires the catechumen to say, "I believe and am baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit"⁵, and in his first mystagogical discourse Theodore recalls that he has discussed the

¹ See PG 33. 1073B and *Rituale Armenorum*, pp. 439–440. Daniélou discusses the symbolism of orientation (op. cit., pp. 30–33). See especially F. J. Dölger, *Die Sonne der Gerechtigkeit und der Schwarze* (Münster 1918), pp. 1–18.

² Instruction 12, 49–51 (ACW 31, pp. 188–189).

³ Instruction 11, 26 (ibid., 168–169).

⁴ See, e. g., PG 33. 451A, 505B, 1042B, 1063A. Etheria says that the catechumens received the Symbol after five weeks of instruction, during which the Creed was explained to them phrase by phrase (Pétré, *Ethérie*, p. 259).

⁵ SeT, p. 367.

Creed in former instructions. He also says that after the exorcisms the catechumen is brought to the priest (i. e. the bishop) and before him makes his engagements and promises. Further on he tells us that these engagements and promises deal with faith and the Creed¹.

But Chrysostom is not clear on the *reddito symboli*. He, too, has discussed portions of the Creed, the unity and trinity of God, the incarnation and death of Christ. And prior to his explanation of the renunciation of Satan and attachment to Christ, in an instruction given on Holy Thursday, he does say that this whole discourse is called faith and that he will entrust nothing else to the catechumens until they shall say "I believe". This word is a foundation stone unshaken which holds up an unshaken edifice. He bids them first to believe in God and then to speak out that word loud and clear. If they cannot say "I believe" they will be able neither to speak nor understand any other word². Further on in this same discourse, immediately before explaining the renunciation-attachment ceremony, he says: "As regards the instruction on faith ($\tauὸν περὶ πίστεως λόγον$), I shall leave that task for your teacher."³ Since the teacher was probably the bishop, it may well be that he led the catechumens in the triple recitation of the Creed which is found in the *Ordo* of Constantinople⁴.

IV

Anointing of the Catechumens

The last of the three ceremonies which emphasize the struggle with Satan is the anointing of the catechumens. In Cyril of Jerusalem there is only one anointing, that of the whole body. Cyril says: Then, when you were stripped, you were anointed with exorcised oil, from the hairs of your head to your feet, and were

¹ Ibid. 363, 369.

² Instruction 11, 15–16 (ACW 31, p. 165).

³ Ibid., p. 166.

⁴ See *Rituale Armenorum*, p. 440. In Homily 40 on 1 Corinthians (PG 61, 347–349) Chrysostom is discussing "baptism of the dead" and there suggests that the recitation of the Creed may have immediately preceded baptism itself. He says: We add this at the end . . . "I believe in the resurrection of the dead", and in this faith we are baptized. For after we confess this [dogma] along with the others, we go down into the fountain of living waters.

made partakers of the good olive-tree, Jesus Christ¹. The ritual of Theodore of Mopsuestia speaks of two: the first is an anointing of the forehead and occurs immediately after the contract with Christ; the second is an anointing of the whole body and immediately precedes baptism. Of the first, the ritual says: And the bishop . . . signs you on the forehead with the oil of anointing and says, "So and so is signed in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." Your sponsor, standing behind you, spreads a linen stole over your head, lifts you from your knees, and makes you stand erect². Of the second, the ritual states: You are coming, now, to baptism, and first you remove all your clothes; as is required you are anointed over your whole body with the oil of anointing. The bishop begins by saying, "So and so is anointed in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." Then you go down into the water sanctified by the blessing of the bishop³.

Chrysostom also recognizes two anointings. The first anointing, that on the forehead, was closely connected with the ceremony of the contract with Christ, as Theodore also has it, and hence may have taken place on Friday. In the two catecheses where Chrysostom speaks of this first anointing, he introduces it with these words: "After the contract, after the renunciation of the devil and the covenant with Christ . . ."⁴ How long after? In the one discourse Chrysostom gives no clear indication of the interval; the other seems to hint that the anointing comes immediately after the covenant ceremony⁵. What was the time lapse between the two anointings? Again one of the discourses yields no clue, while the other states that the second anointing takes place in the

¹ PG 33. 1080. Cyril then points out the symbolism and power of the exorcised oil: After you have been cut away from the wild olive tree, you are grafted on to the good one and become sharers in the richness of the good olive tree. The exorcised oil, therefore, is a symbol of your partnership in the richness of Christ, a charm which puts to flight every trace of the power which opposes us. Just as the breathing of holy men upon you and the invocation of the name of God, like a raging fire, burns and puts to flight the demons, so also this exorcised oil, by prayer and the invocation of God's name, receives such power that it not only burns and cleanses away every trace of our sins but also puts to flight all the unseen powers of the wicked one (*ibid.*).

² SeT, pp. 399–401.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 419.

⁴ Instruction 2, 22 (ACW 31, p. 51) and 11, 27 (*ibid.*, p. 169).

⁵ Instruction 11, 27 (*ibid.*).

darkness of the night and, consequently, would seem to come immediately before the baptism on Saturday night¹. What was the formula of this first anointing? Again one discourse records no formula whereas the other gives the same formula which is used for the second anointing in Theodore of Mopsuestia: "So and so is anointed in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit."²

The purpose and symbolism of this first anointing is very much the same in both catecheses. In the one, the enemy is furious . . . when he sees those who were formerly subject to his sovereignty not only renouncing him but going over to the side of Christ. Therefore, says Chrysostom, the priest anoints you on the forehead and puts on you the sign of the cross, so that the enemy may turn away his eyes. For he does not dare to look you in the face when he sees the lightning flash which leaps forth from it and blinds his eyes. From that day, there is strife and counter-strife with him and, on this account, the priest leads you into the spiritual arena as athletes of Christ by virtue of this anointing³. In the second discourse, it is God Himself, through the agency of the priest, Who anoints the face of the catechumen and stamps thereon the sign of the cross. In this way God holds in check all the frenzy of the evil one; for Satan will not dare to look upon such a sight. Just as if he had beheld the rays of the sun and leaped away, so will his eyes be blinded by the catechumen's face and he will depart. "For through the chrism the cross is stamped upon you", says Chrysostom. The chrism is a mixture of olive-oil and unguent: the unguent is for the bride, the oil is for the athlete⁴.

The second anointing, that of the whole body, immediately precedes baptism and will protect Christ's new soldier in the conflict with Satan. "In the full darkness of the night the priest strips off your robe and, as if he were about to lead you into heaven by the ritual, he causes your whole body to be anointed with that olive oil of the spirit, so that all your limbs may be fortified and unconquered by the darts which the adversary aims

¹ Instruction 2, 24 (*ibid.*, p. 52). The candidates were stripped for this second anointing and it was in this condition that they descended into the baptismal pool.

² *Ibid.*, p. 51; see SeT, p. 419.

³ ACW 31, p. 52.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 169.

at you.”¹ But the priest has only a ministerial function as Chrysostom reminds the candidates. “And that you may again know that it is not man but God Himself who anoints you by the hand of the priest, listen to St. Paul when he says: It is God who is warrant for us and for you in Christ, who has anointed us (2 Cor. 1.21). After He anoints all your limbs with this ointment you will be secure and able to hold the serpent in check; you will suffer no harm.”²

The stripping off of the garments is a symbol of stripping off the old man of sin and mortality, and of a return to primitive innocence³. After Adam sinned, he was naked because he sinned; in the new covenant, the candidate is stripped that he may be freed from sin. Adam put off the glory that once was his; before entering the waters of baptism, the candidate puts off the old man as easily as he takes off his clothes⁴.

The actual anointing, a service apparently performed by deaconesses in the case of women candidates⁵, had the double symbolism of healing the soul of all trace of sin and of strengthening it for the conflict with Satan. The oil is both a remedy for the sick and a preparation for the athlete.

¹ Ibid., p. 52.

² Ibid., p. 169.

³ See Cyril (PG 33. 1077, 1080) and Theodore (SeT, p. 417).

⁴ See Chrysostom's sixth homily on Colossians (PG 62. 342).

⁵ Baur 1, p. 84, says that the men were anointed by deacons, the women by deaconesses, and refers to In Col. 6 (PG 62. 342), but there is no mention in this place of either deacons or deaconesses. In Chrysostom's time, however, there were deaconesses in the Church. See In 1 Tim. 11 (PG 62. 553). Theodore says that the anointing was performed by those appointed (i. e. ordained?) for this service (SeT, p. 419) without specifying who they are. A deaconess in the early Church was not, properly speaking, ordained, nor did she exercise properly ministerial functions; see Epiphanius, *Haer.* 79. 3 (PG 42. 744–745A); W. P. LeSaint S. J., ACW 13, pp. 121–122. “Her most important function was the assistance at the baptism of women, at which, for reasons of propriety, many of the ceremonies could not be performed by the deacons” (The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, ed. F. L. Cross [London 1957], p. 377). The patristic texts have been collected by J. Mayer, *Monumenta de viduis, diaconissis, virginibusque tractantia* (Florilegium patristicum 42, Bonn 1938). Touttée, in a note on Cyril, *Catechesis* 20, 3 (PG 33. 1079), says that at Jerusalem it was contrary to the canons for the anointing to be entrusted to deaconesses or to anyone other than the priest who was administering baptism. He cites as proof a story of Conon, priest of the monastery of Penthecula, a beautiful Persian baptizand, and a vision of John the Baptist as recounted by Johannes Moschus in his *Pratum spirituale* 3 (PG 87, pars tertia, 2853–2855). The story is interesting, highly improbable, and makes no mention of the canons.

Now the catechumen-soldier, the athlete of Christ, is ready for a life-long conflict with Satan, but he need not fear his adversary. During the thirty days of his instruction he has been training, as it were, in a wrestling school; he has learned the devil's grips, his tricks, his wicked artifices and has learned how to overcome them¹. The catechumen cannot be tricked; he can approach the combat with confidence. He is stripped and anointed for the struggle. And now the day for the contest has arrived, the stadium is open, the spectators are seated above the arena. But the Judge of the contest does not, as in the secular games, lead the contestant around and say: Does anyone accuse this man? Rather, he calls aloud: Even if all men and the demons who stand by the devil's side accuse this man of the most enormous and unspeakable crimes, I do not reject him nor do I loathe him; I have set him free from his accusers, I have absolved him of his wickedness, and I lead him, free and absolved, to the contest. In the arena contests the judge stands impartially in the middle. In the spiritual contests, the Judge of the games of piety becomes our helper in all things; He joins forces with the contestants in the conflict with Satan².

In this wise do the catecheses of Chrysostom take the catechumen through the rites of exorcism, the renouncement of Satan and the covenant with Christ, and the pre-baptismal anointings. The instructions are calculated to bring light to the illuminand's mind, strength to his will, and faith to his soul. Thus enlightened and thus strengthened he will go down into the bath of sacred waters. There the eyes of the flesh will see water, the eyes of faith will behold the Spirit; the eyes of the body will see the body baptized, the eyes of faith will see the old man buried; the eyes of the flesh will see the flesh being washed, the eyes of the spirit will see the soul being cleansed; the eyes of the body will see the body emerging from the water, the eyes of faith will see the new man come forth brightly shining from that sacred purification³.

¹ See ACW 31, pp. 141, 295.

² Ibid., pp. 140, 183.

³ Ibid., p. 164.

Studies in Early Western Devotion to the Choirs of Saints

J. HENNIG, Basel

In his paper "The Litany of Saints in the Stowe Missal" E. Bishop¹ arrived at the following conclusions: The Irish received the framework of this litany from the English. This was at first a private devotion, far from having a strictly liturgical character. The English and Irish were the first to propagate such a litany of saints in the eighth century in Gaul and Germany.

With regard to the first of these conclusions I confine myself to saying that the feature to be considered in this paper did not belong to the "framework". That framework consisted of names of individual saints followed by an invocation of "all the saints"; the arrangement of the names of the individual saints however was conducive to what Bishop described in his paper as the subdivision of all the saints into "categories".

Bishop admitted that "the ejaculatory, litanic, asyndetic type of prayer is particularly suited to the Irish genius" – and some of us will agree with Bishop's saying "is" rather than merely "was". It is my contention that the devotion to what is better described as the "choirs" of saints has been a manifestation of that genius, emphasizing as it does the ejaculatory, litanic character. Invocation in particular implies naming. It was impossible to name all the saints individually, firstly because a large number of saints were not known at all or at least not by name², secondly because those known by name were too nume-

¹ J. Theol. Stud. 7, 1905/06, 122–136, reprinted in *Liturgica historica* (1918) 137–164.

² See the ending of the *Martyrology of Tallaght* (Henry Bradshaw Society [H. B. S.] LXVIII, 1931) 89: *et sandorum ceterorum quorum Deus nomina nominavit et quos prescivit . . .* The present paper follows up my studies listed in note 1 of my paper in *Studia Patristica* V (TU 80, 1962, 69–82), which appeared in an extended form in *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 7, 1961, 1–44; also "The place of the Fathers in early Irish devotional literature"

rous. The *Martyrology of Tallaght* occupies a unique place in the tradition of the *Hieronymianum* in so far as it reduced this "historical" martyrology (again) to a bare list of names and in so far as what appear as repetitions, misplacements or entries not found elsewhere – so numerous in the *Martyrology of Tallaght* – must be interpreted as results of a scrupulous desire in the compiler of that work not to miss any commemoration. When abstracting the *Martyrology of Tallaght* into his versified vernacular work known as *félire*, Oengus¹ in his epilogue expressed the idea that his "abridgment" (v. 123) had to be supplemented by a summary invocation of the "hosts" (*drong*) in order to attain to what may be termed virtual completeness. The invocation of these "hosts", possibly represented by one individual leader, was the minimum of naming which ensured as it were the invocations' reaching their address.

The oldest reference to categories of saints that has found its place in the Western liturgy is in the *Te Deum*; this has also remained the main text uniting, in this field, practically all Christians. The *Te Deum* has been preserved in many early records of the Irish church. In the *Book of Cerne* it is preceded by the *Lorica of Laid-cend*² which contains the words:

defendant... et me procedant in acie caelestis exercitus militiae cherupin et seraphin... opto thronos viventes archangelos principatus et potestates angelos... deinde ceteros agonithetas patriarchas... prophetas, apostolos... martyres, omnes peto antheletas Dei.

This text is obviously related with the Stowe Memento³

pro anathletico gradu venerabilium patriarcharum, profetarum, apostolorum et martirum et omniumque sanctorum.

The numerous references to the categories of saints in the *Book of Cerne* and in the *Stowe Missal* in conjunction with other early Irish texts illustrate two points:

(Ir. Eccl. Rec. 84, 1955, 226–234), "Socia exsultatione" (Liturgisches Jahrbuch 12, 1962, 45–53), "Communicatio angelica" (Geist und Leben 36, 1963, 205–215), "The Megas Kanon of Andrew of Crete and the Félire of Oengus the Culdee" (Mediaeval Studies 25, 1963, 280–295) and "Die Chöre der Heiligen" (Arch. f. Liturgiewiss. 8, 1964, 436–456).

¹ H. B. S. XXIX, 1905, 269.

² Ed. A. B. Kuypers (Cambridge 1902) 85; Kenney, Sources for the Early History of Ireland, 1929, 721.

³ H. B. S. XXXII, 1915, 14.

1. The prayer to the Saints originated from prayer for, in memory of, later in honour of, saints, which in turn is connected with the prayer for the dead and for the living¹ (*sanc tus* in the wider original sense of the word surviving in the connotation of the Irish term *nóibh*).

2. Apart from the stages of prayer for, in memory of, in honour of and to the saints, we must distinguish with reference to the last stage various degrees of directness of invocation up to the final vocative plus *ora(te) pro nobis* which we have in the "framework" of the litany referred to by Bishop.

Thus we have e. g. in the *Lorica of Laid-cend* the optative invocation where the saints appear in the nominative or accusative cases. In the *Book of Cerne* we have another degree of the optative form of indirect invocation:

*In fide patriarcharum
meritis prophetarum
pace apostolorum
gaudio angelorum
splendore sanctorum
operibus monachorum
virtute justorum
martyrio martyrum
castitate virginum (Oratio matutinalis)²,*

where the saints are invoked indirectly with reference to specific characteristics of their "category", the historical aspect being sometimes given a turn abstract or practical. This feature is familiar from the Commons of Saints in the Missal and led to the representation of certain virtues by categories of saints or their leaders and exercised great influence on the thought and the arts of the later Middle Ages.

We come nearer to direct invocation in the *Oratio Gregorii papae* (also found in the *Books of Nunnaminster* and of *Fleury* and in Harl. 7653³):

*Miserere mei deus angelorum
dirige me rex angelorum
custodi me per orationes patriarcharum
merita prophetarum
suffragia apostolorum*

¹ See the position of the commemorations of the saints among petitions in the Stowe Mass (ed. cit. 7 and 11).

² Ed. cit. 91.

³ Ed. cit. 101 and 232.

*victoria martyrum
fidem confessorum qui placerunt tibi ab initio mundi¹.*

Similarly God is invoked by, rather than through, the saints in the *Oratio sancta ad dominum coeli*:

*Deduc mihi ubi resplendent semper angelorum milia . . .
viginis quattuor seniores sunt proni agnum dei laudantes
mystica quattuor animalia tota oculis plena tam mira magnalia
patriarchae primi² credentes
prophetae puri spiritu sancto pleni Christum conlaudent
. . . Maria, episcopi, martyres, virgines, sanctorum turbae*

a passage to which again a parallel will be found in the *Stowe Missal*. At this point it becomes obvious that Bishop's description of our subject as "categories" is inadequate. References to the "categories" of saints are a means of overcoming the "asynthetic" devotion. The groups of saints however are not invented as a means of subdividing and enumerating, but are considered as a reality, as choirs³ joining as such in the eternal praise of God. Indeed, in all the stages outlined above, references to these "choirs" become a participation in this praise. The ever increasing number of subdivisions and the variety of subdivisions suggests the presence of an urge, insisting almost impatiently on invocation, a restlessness very much different from the stately sobriety of the classical Roman liturgy. It is outside the scope of this paper to show the extent to which this "genius" of private devotion has left its traces in the Western liturgy. May it suffice to point out that this influence appears in the liturgical functions relating to the beginning and the end of life: The prayer *Deus angelorum*⁴ in the *Order of Baptism* (of an Adult) and the prayers *Proficisciere* and *Commendo te* of the *Commendatio Animae*. The eminent position occupied by private devotion in early Christian Ireland is most noticeable in vernacular literature. *Félice Oengusso* is the greatest work of early Irish religious literature and the highest development of the *félire*, a devotion which compensated the absence of a *Sanctorale* in early Irish liturgy.

The third section of Oengus's epilogue consists of an enumeration of the choirs of saints: "After reckoning their *félé* (days

¹ An expression ensuring virtual completeness in the historical field and occurring also in the Eastern liturgy and in the *Stowe Missal* (see G. Manz, *Ausdrucksformen der lateinischen Liturgiesprache*, Beuron 1941, 379).

² "First" in the sense of time, of strength and of typical significance.

³ The equivalent Irish expressions (*Oengus*) would require special attention..

⁴ See above the *Oratio Gregorii papae*.

of commemoration), I will number (*rim*) their hosts" (v. 231). The military expressions used synonymously for the "choirs" of saints are specifically derived from the Biblical application of such terms to the Angels. Oengus then enumerates

archangels (led and represented by Michael)

ancestors (*rerach* – Noah)

prophets (*ſáithe* = vates, in the second line of this quatrain:

profeta, – Isaías) and patriarchs (*nasal-athraig* – Abraham)

apostles (Peter) and disciples (Paul)

martyrs (Stephen), anchorites (Paul) and holy virgins (Mary)

bishops of Rome (Peter), Jerusalem (James), Antioch (Peter) and Alexandria
(Mark)

holy soldiers (Honoratius), "the troop of wisdom" (Benedict), the troop
of George, the holy Innocents, priests (Aaron), monks (Anthony).

the high saints of the world¹ (Martin), noble saints of Eriu (Patrick)

and Alba (Columbkille), the virgins of Eriu (Brigid).

While this paper is not concerned with the development in detail of numbers, names and representatives of the various choirs, the following points should be noted:

1. The distinction between ancestors and patriarchs may be compared with that between *propatores* and patriarchs in the liturgy of the Eastern Church. Furthermore the reference made in the latter (between the *propatores* and the patriarchs) to the *pateres* (in the final prayer of the liturgy of St. Chrysostom described as *hosioi kai theophoroi*) may be linked with Oengus's reference to the "troop of wisdom"; in the Stowe diptychs the *patres heremi sciti* are led by Paul and Anthony.

2. The establishment of a special group of "national" saints was a particularity of Ireland. The Martyrology of Tallaght added to the entries gathered from the Hieronymianum for each day a separate list, about equal in number, of names of Irish saints, a fact which also demonstrates the wider connotation of the term *noibh*. In the Stowe diptychs the Old Testament saints and the apostles² are followed by the categories of martyrs (three representatives), *patres heremi sciti* (see above) and the bishops with Martin, Gregory, Maximus and Felix and by an equal number of Irish saints.

3. The establishment by Oengus of a special group of "high saints" (*ard-noeb*) shows that the word *noib* more

¹ *in beta* (Stokes, ed. cit. 276).

² No categories are mentioned, apparently because enumeration is considered as explicitly complete.

specifically covered that group of saints to which the term "confessors" was applied. In the *Stowe Missal* the prayer *super oblata* says:

In commemorationem beatorum apostolorum tuorum, ac martirum tuorum et confessorum quorum hic reliquias specialiter recolimus N. et eorum quorum festivitas hodie celebratur.

I suggest that in this instance, and in similar instances where the letter N. indicates the insertion of names, the names of all the saints entered for the day in the *Martyrology of Tallaght* were read and that this fact accounts for the reduction of the *Hieronymianum* by the *Tallactense* to a bare list of names in the genitive case. This would mean that the *Martyrology of Tallaght* was a liturgical book.

The fact that the Epistle is I. Cor. 11: 26–33 and the Gospel John 5: 51–53 makes the main Stowe Mass a Votive Mass of the Blessed Sacrament. This Mass has a special Collect *in sollemnitatibus petri et christi* and versions of the *Communicantes* proper to Christmas, the Circumcision, the Epiphany, Easter, the Ascension and Pentecost. Instead of a Proper, the *Stowe Missal* has only a Mass of the Saints, a Mass for penitents and a Mass for several deceased persons. The Mass for the Saints bears the title *Misa apostolorum et martirum et sanctorum et sanctatarum virginum*. The last five words of this title may be translated by "and confessors and holy virgins"; the word *sanctatarum* would then distinguish from the "virgins" mentioned together with widows and orphans after those living in this habitation, the Emperors and the army and those *in sublimitate constituti* as subjects of the Supplications in the Stowe Mass¹. The five last words of the title of the Stowe *Misa apostolorum*, however, could also be translated by "and the holy virgins male and female". The Irish word óg denotes "young, whole, perfect and virgin(al)". As a noun it occurs in Félice *Oengusso* only with regard to female saints, but the adjective and abstract noun derived therefrom is frequently applied to Christ (Nov. 14) and to male saints – notably March 29: *fir co n-húagi* = "man of virginity" – and

¹ Compare the position of the petitions *pro apostolis, pro sanctis prophetis, pro sanctis confessoribus* and for the hierarchy between the petitions *pro pace, pro fide* and the petitions *pro imperio, pro navigantibus, pro defunctis* in *Testamentum Domini* (which originated in fifth century Syria): Dict. d'Arch. Chrét. et de Liturgie 9, 1548.

Ep. v. 131 to the saints in general (*noeb nóige*)¹. In the Irish *Litany of Jesus*² which enumerates no less than twenty-seven choirs of saints, after the apostles the *maccu ina fir-oige* (literally: *filii verae virtutis*) are mentioned.

In the first prayer of the Stowe *Misa apostolorum* God is beseeched

*per prevelegia clara patriarcharum
gloriosa presagia profetarum
sancta merita apostolorum
marteria martirum
fidem confessorum
sanctitatem virginum
teoricam vitam anchoritarum
silentium spiritale manachorum
episcoporum ac abbatum catholicorum principatum . . .
spcialiter autem per sancta suffragia sanctorum vel sanctarum
virginum quorum hodie sollemnitas a nobis celebratur . . . in honorem
eorum N. offerimus . . .*

clearly an extension – more appropriate in terms – of the *Oratio Gregorii papae*. The placing of *virgines* between the confessors and anchorites and the later renewed reference to the *suffragia sanctorum vel sanctarum virginum* seems to confirm that the second translation proposed above for the last five words of the title of this *Misa* is correct.

The second prayer of this *Misa* refers primarily to the twelve apostles but mentions *et alios sanctos quasi tuos vel eorum vicarios* *gratia spiritu sancti ac doctrina preditos per horum patrocinia N.* *quorum festivitas hodie colitur*. It would appear that in both the first and the second prayer reference is made on one level of *sancti* in heaven and on earth.

The third prayer reads:

Deus qui nos sanctorum tuorum beatissimorum spirituum angelorum (follow names of choirs of angels) *patriarcharum profetarum apostolorum martirum confessorumque et virginum anchoritarum coenovilarum omniumque sanctorum concivium supernorum et intercessionibus gloriosis circumdas et protegis . . .*

a typical indirect invocation showing the transition from invoking the example of the saints to invoking their intercession, the

¹ In the litanic prayer *Atoch frit* (saec. IX?; Kenney, Sources no. 580) the “virgins of the world” are placed under John the Evangelist, this only non-martyr among the Apostles thus being proclaimed leader of the main choir of non-martyr saints, and are distinguished from “the female saints of the world under Mary”.

² H. B. S. LXII, 1925, 30f.

virgines again appearing between the male saints. The fourth prayer says:

Orent pro nobis sancti martyres et pro defunctis nostris et pro pecoribus et pro omnibus terrae nostrae fructibus et pro omnibus in hoc loco commorantibus. Te omnipotentem deum creaturarum caelestium et terrestrium innumerabilis multitudo sanctorum tuorum et angelorum chori incessibili voce proclamant dicentes sanctus . . .

but the next text is a Preface which of course again leads up to the *Sanctus*. The word *chorus* here appears in the Irish liturgy in its definite connotation for the social unit by which the whole creation is subdivided under the aspect of its participation in the praise offered by the angels to God. The fourth prayer of this *Misa* is a curious illustration of the connection between prayer for and to the saints and prayer for the dead and for the living. The idea that the holy martyrs are to pray for the cattle and for the harvest may be described as another expression of "the Irish genius".

The Preface of the Stowe Mass for the saints refers twice to the saints commemorated *hodie* and concludes:

omnis angeli et archangeli, profete et apostoli, martyres et confessores, virgines et omnes sancti . . . cum quatuor animalibus venti quatuor senioribus concinunt, the final words being a parallel to the *Oratio sancta ad dominum caeli* in the *Book of Cerne*. Here the arrangement of the choirs of saints, which then attained general recognition in the Western world, is complete (angels, Old Testament saints, apostles, New Testament saints, male and female), but the pairing of choirs in this instance (see also the epilogue of *Félice Oengusso* and the Litany of All the Saints to this day) is of interest. This pairing suggests special affinity between certain choirs and takes place perhaps in pursuit of the musical conception described by the term antiphony. The second last prayer of the Stowe *Misa apostolorum* leads directly from the *Sanctus* to the *Qui pridie* offering a unique version of indirect invocation: *Deus quem benedicimus in apostolis et in omnibus sanctis suis qui placuerunt ei ab initio saeculi* (see above p. 241, note 1), which takes us back to the shortest and oldest form of categorial references to the saints (see the *Libera nos* of the Mass)¹ where only the apostles are mentioned.

¹ *Stowe Missal*, ed. cit., 17 where the name of St. Patrick is added (as it is in Sangall. 1394).

In the Western Church no country has made a contribution as wide, as systematic and as varied to the development of the basic pattern of devotion to all the saints as has Ireland. The preoccupation of the old Irish church with the subject of the choirs of saints can be pursued in Irish tradition of hagiography and private devotion right through the Middle Ages.

Gelasio I y el Sermon *De neglecta solemnitate* (PL 54, 433—444)

J. JANINI, Valencia

El sermón *De neglecta solemnitate* figura entre los atribuidos al papa san León el Grande (*Sermo 84*, alias 81) por Quesnel y los hermanos Ballerini. Sin embargo, ni por su estilo ni por su cronología encaja en la obra genuina leoniana. Por otra parte, el larentesco de la pieza oratoria con algunos textos litúrgicos de Gelasio I, así como el tono más áspero y duro de la repremisión al pueblo romano, lo sitúa en la misma línea de lucha contra las costumbres paganzantes de la Urbe de su carta contra las Lupercales. El sermón, en el pontificado del papa Gelasio, refleja con claridad el suceso histórico del «día de castigo y liberación» de Roma.

I

La cronología del sermón

Tres manifiestas alusiones a sucesos históricos permiten establecer la cronología del sermón *De neglecta solemnitate*.

1º. En el exordio, el autor contrasta la actitud del pueblo romano en la solemnidad de acción de gracias por el día de castigo y liberación de la Urbe. En otro tiempo, cuando la institución de la fiesta estaba más próxima al hecho acaecido, todo el pueblo fiel afluyía a la iglesia. En cambio, en la conmemoración celebrada unos días antes fue de tal modo descuidada la devoción religiosa, que apenas hubo asistentes:

Religiosam devotionem, dilectissimi, qua ob diem castigationis et liberationis nostrae, cunctus fidelium populus ad agendas Deo gratias confluebat, pene ab omnibus proxime fuisse neglectam, ipse paucorum qui adfuerunt raritas demonstravit (c. 1).

2º. La idea central se desarrolla en forma de áspera repremisión por la ingratitud del pueblo romano. El papa fustiga sus pagani-

zantes costumbres, resaltando que acude mayor muchedumbre a los *insana spectacula* que a las tumbas de los mártires, como si Roma hubiera sido liberada por el *ludus Circensium* y no por las oraciones de los santos:

Pudet dicere, sed necesse est non tacere: plus impeditur daemonis quam apostolis, et maiores obtinunt frequentiam insana spectacula quam beata martyria. Quis hanc urbem reformavit saluti? quis a captivitate eruit? quis a caede defendit? ludus Circensium an cura sanctorum? quorum utique precibus divinas censurae flexa sententia est, ut qui merebamur iram servaremur ad veniam (c. 1).

3º Al final del breve sermón, insiste el papa en que la liberación no fue, como opinan los impíos, efecto de las estrellas, sino obra de la misericordia de Dios, que se dignó mitigar los corazones de los enfurecidos bárbaros:

Et liberationem nostram, non, sicut opinantur impii, stellarum effectibus, sed ineffabili omnipotentis Dei misericordiae deputantes, qui corda furentium barbarorum mitigare dignatus est, ad tanti vos beneficis memoriam toto fidei vigore conferte (c. 2).

Las dificultades para atribuir este sermón al papa san León el Grande surgen a cada paso. El cardenal Baronio pensó que el suceso debía referirse a Atila. En cambio, Quesnel y los Ballerini, en sus prolíjas anotaciones (PL 54, 432 ss), creen que se trata de la irrupción de los vándalos y el saco de Genserico (junio 455). En nuestros días, G. Morin propuso otra fecha más remota: la toma de Roma por Alarico (agosto 410)¹.

Ninguna de estas hipótesis satisface. Ante todo, no concuerdan con el texto del sermón, en el cual se afirma claramente que la solemnidad descuidada era en acción de gracias *ob diem castigationis et liberationis nostrae*. No se compagina, pues, con el saco de Genserico, que duró catorce días (desde el 2 al 16 de junio, según los cálculos de Mommsen, universalmente admitidos), ni con el de Alarico, que duró tres días (desde el 14 al 17 de agosto, según algunos; desde el 24 al 27, según otros historiadores, entre ellos L. Duchesne)².

Tampoco aparece la oportunidad de la alusión a los *insana spectacula* ni al *ludus Circensium*, siendo así que en el mes del junio no se celebraban. Los juegos Apolinares eran en julio, y el día 13, como ya anotaron los Ballerini, se tenían en el circo.

¹ G. Morin, *Une fête romaine éphémère du V^e siècle: l'anniversaire de la prise de Rome par Alaric*: Historisches Jahrbuch der Görres-Gesellschaft 53, 1933, 45–50.

² L. Duchesne, *Histoire ancienne de l'Eglise*, 3, 1910, 150–158; 646–651.

Mucho más inverosímil es la cronología del sermón en los posteriores años del pontificado de san León, según piensan los hermanos Ballerini. Suponen que en menos de un lustro, desde el 455 hasta la fecha en que fue pronunciado, la devoción prístina se había enfriado. Pero en la genuina predicación de san León consta todo lo contrario. Los fieles escuchaban complacidos sus elocuentes sermones y hasta se anticipaban, en su fervor religioso, a las exhortaciones pastorales del obispo de Roma (*Sermo 46, 1*). En la hipótesis de G. Morin, situando el hecho histórico en la época de Alarico (410), hay tiempo suficiente para que la antigua solemnidad hubiera caído casi en desuso. Sin embargo, a su argumentación cabe responder que san León no sólo conservó las observancias de sus mayores, sino que les dio mayor vigor. Bastaría recordar su abundante predicación sobre los ayunos y prácticas religiosas de las Cuatro Témperas.

Todas estas dificultades de cronología desaparecen, si atribuimos el *De neglecta solemnitate* a su verdadero autor, el papa san Gelasio I (492–496). Con idéntico estilo polémico nos informa, en su carta contra las Lupercales, de los sucesos históricos que más honda huella dejaron en el pueblo romano:

*Numquid cum haec celebrarentur, a Gallis Roma non capta est et saepe numero ad extrema quaeque pervenit? Numquid bellis civilibus sub hac celebritate non concidit? Numquid Lupercalia deerant quando urbem Alarico evertit? Et nuper, cum Anthemii et Ricimeris civili furore subversa est, ubi sunt Lupercalia? Cur istis minime profuerunt?*¹

En la guerra civil de Antemio y Ricimero, Roma, como afirma Gelasio, *subversa est*. En efecto, en 472 Ricimero había sitiado la urbe; el 11 de julio fue saqueada, mientras moría asesinado Antemio. Sin duda fue el día máximo del «furor civil», pero al mismo tiempo significó el fin de la guerra. En memoria de ese día (*ob diem castigationis et liberationis nostrae*) fue instituida la festividad de acción de gracias. Gobernaba la sede de Pedro el papa Simplicio (468–482). Los cambios de pontificado, al sucederle Felix III (482–492) y Gelasio I (492–496), explican también los cambios de costumbres y la paulatina pérdida de devoción en la asistencia a la festividad conmemorativa.

Gelasio había sido secretario de sus predecesores, Simplicio y Félix III. Estaba, pues, bien informado y había sido testigo

¹ Gelase I^{er}, Lettre contre les Lupercales et dix-huit messes du sacrementaire leonien, ed. G. Pomarès; Sources chrétiennes, n° 65 (París, 1959) p. 182.

del numeroso concurso de fieles de otros tiempos (*cunctus fidelium populus ad agendas Deo gratias confluebat*). Vio, empero, con gran tristeza que el 11 de julio del 492, primer año de su pontificado, la iglesia estaba semivacía (*pauorum qui adfuerunt raritas*). Dos días después (13 julio), en plenas fiestas Apolinares, se llenaba el circo. El contraste era demasiado evidente, para que Gelasio no aprovechara la ocasión, en la primera oportunidad que se le presentó, para reprochar al pueblo romano no sólo su ingratitud, sino también sus paganizantes costumbres. ¿Quién había liberado Roma? *ludus Circensium an cura sanctorum?* Sus ataques a los *insana spectacula* repletos de muchedumbre, son el preludio de la lucha contra las Lupercales. El papa las suprimirá y mantendrá firmemente su decisión, frente a los locos conatos (*insanis conatibus*)¹ del senador Andrómaco y otros romanos que pretendían revivir las paganas costumbres de la Urbe. La frase del sermón *plus impenditur daemonis quam apostolis* anuncia una campaña de Gelasio I para honrar litúrgicamente a los apóstoles Pedro y Pablo y a los santos venerados en Roma. Así nos explicamos la profusión de sus *sacramentorum prefationes* compiladas en el famoso Sacramentario de Verona.

En cuanto a la transmisión manuscrita, dejo la cuestión para otro lugar. No me ha sido posible cotejar los códices existentes en Roma. Sin embargo, por los datos de los Ballerini, vemos que la pieza fue titulada de modo diverso. Unas veces *In Octavis apostolorum Petri et Pauli*. En otra colección, *Sermo sancti Leonis pape ad populum*, colocado en la dominica 6^a post Natalem Apostolorum. Tal vez la mención de san Pedro, al final del sermón (*ut beatus Petrus et omnes sancti qui nobis semper in multis tribulationibus affuerunt, c. 2*) motivó su inclusión en la Octava o en la sexta dominica después del natalicio de los apóstoles. Nada obsta que en algunas colecciones se atribuyera la pieza a san León; es sabida la tendencia a incluir sermones amparados con los nombres de los más famosos predicadores, como León, Agustín, etc. Pienso que el título *De neglecta solemnitate*, en la tabla de una colección, es el que refleja mejor el original de la transmisión manuscrita.

¹ Lupercales, nº 32, ed. G. Pomarès, p. 188.

II

El estilo gelasiano y sus fuentes agustinianas

Bajo el aspecto literario, el sermón *De neglecta solemnitate* dista mucho del genuino estilo de san León el Grande. La pieza es mucho más breve que sus sermones conmemorativos y carece del brillante exordio, así como de los párrafos cincelados con su peculiar musicalidad. Compárese, por ejemplo, con los tres sermones de su aniversario episcopal (5, 3 y 4, escritos por ese orden)¹ y con el del natalicio de los apóstoles san Pedro y san Pablo (*sermo 82*)². Entre ellos pueden multiplicarse paralelos ideológicos y estilísticos (parejas de adverbios comparativos, etc), citas bíblicas. Son obras maestras de la oratoria leoniana, que acreditan al elegante predicador y fino estilista. Su prosa es siempre equilibrada, ecuánime.

Completamente diverso es el estilo de nuestro sermón. Su tono de reprensión es más bien áspero, duro, salpicado de frases audaces, en las que el autor revela sus grandes dotes de polemista, lo mismo que en su carta contra las Lupercales. Sin salirnos del párrafo arriba transrito, que contiene la idea central del discurso gelasiano, podemos comprobar idénticas ideas, vocabulario y estilo.

a) *Pudet dicere . . . plus impeditur daemonis quam apostolis.* Es una frase valiente y vigorosa. Difícilmente la hubiera escrito el ponderado predicador que fue san León. En cambio, Gelasio reitera el verbo avergonzar en su carta contra las Lupercales: *cur vos pudet per vos ipsos talia celebrare?* (*Lup. n° 17, lin. 5*); *nil superest omnino quod pudeat* (*Lup. 20, 8*); *cur vos pudeat agere, si salubre est?* (*Lup. 26, 6*). En cuanto a los demonios, está en la misma linea que el apóstrofe: *Sacrificetur in templis daemonum et in Capitolio profana vanitas celebratur!* (*Lup. 28, 3*).

¹ Dos sermones de aniversario (1 y 2, en la edición Ballerini) son también supositicios. En otra ocasión mostraré las diferencias estilísticas con los genuinamente leonianos (3, 4, 5, en la edición Ballerini).

² El sermón 83 (edición Ballerini) es un centón de fragmentos de otros sermones auténticos. Su exordio *Exultemus in Domino* está copiado del sermón 22 (= *In Nativitate Domini II*); el resto de la pieza fusiona textos de dos sermones de aniversario (= sermones 3 y 4). Jamás fue predicado por san León el centón contenido en el sermo 83. El papa preparaba cuidadosamente su predicación, cuando tenía que reiterar el mismo tema o hablar en la misma festividad.

Para Gelasio, la asistencia a los insanos espectáculos de Roma es una honra a los demonios. Por eso, son incompatibles con la fe cristiana: *Non potest enim mensae Domini participare et mensae daemoniorum . . . non potest templum Dei esse et templum diaboli* (*Lup.* n° 9).

b) *Quis hanc urbem reformavit saluti . . . ludus Circensium an cura sanctorum?* La *salus* del pueblo romano, en el pensamiento del papa, no está en las festividades paganas. Lo arguye en la polémica de las Lupercales: *cur causas vestrae salutis ministristis?* (*Lup.* 25 b, 3); *videritis ipsi quid vobis salutis impendat, quae tantam moribus labem perniciemque proponit* (*Lup.* 19, 8).

Las preguntas e interrogaciones repetidas, la encuesta sobre el vocabulario (*impendere, correctio, censura, etc.*) en pasajes clave, los bipartitos (*nec . . . nec*): todo revela la identidad de mano, en un escritor polémico. Por otra parte, la contraprueba estilística manifiesta que san León, en una breve pieza oratoria, hubiera evitado las demasiadas repeticiones verbales. Estas abundan en el *De neglecta solemnitate*. En efecto, vemos reiterado el giro de acción de gracias (*ad agendas Deo gratias confluebat*, c. 1; *ad agendas gratias revertisse*, c. 2). Tres veces se menciona la ingratitud (*homines esse ingratos Deo*, c. 1; *significans videlicet de ingratis . . . ne ergo ingratorum nota vobis*, c. 2). Dos veces recuerda los beneficios divinos (*per oblivionem beneficiorum eius*, c. 1; *ad tanti beneficii memores*, c. 2). Otras dos veces, la negligencia (*Regligiosam devotionem . . . fuisse neglectam*, c. 1; *Gravis negligentia*, c. 2). Dos veces aparece el mismo comparativo (*maiores frequentiam*, c. 1; *maiore satisfactione*, c. 2). El verbo *dignari* se repite en breves líneas (*dignatus est . . . iuvare dignetur*, c. 2). En los escritos de Gelasio son frecuentes las repeticiones verbales. Quizá por su estilo más ardoroso y espontáneo no creía necesario, como san León, cincelar cada párrafo con búsqueda de vocablos más musicales, *ne fatigetur auditus*.

El africano Gelasio fue un gran admirador de san Jerónimo y de san Agustín, a los que calificó de luminares de la iglesia. Tal vez se le contagió algo del polemista estilo jeronimiano. La advertencia *Pudet dicere* del sermón recuerda el comienzo del párrafo *Piget dicere quot cotidie virgines ruant* de la carta de Jerónimo a Eustoquio (*Ep.* 22, 13).

Mucho más estrecha es la dependencia con los sermones de san Agustín. En uno de ellos, predicado en la fiesta de los apóstoles

san Pedro y san Pablo, muestra el obispo de Hipona su tristeza por la escasa concurrencia de fieles: *Debuimus quidem tantorum martyrum diem . . . maiore frequentia celebrare* (*Sermo 298, 1: PL 38, 1365*); y poco después: *Haec loquor, carissimi, letus quidem hodierno die propter tantam festivitatem, sed aliquentulum tristis, quia non video tantum populum congregatum, quantum debuit in natali passionis apostolorum* (*ibid. c. 2*). La tristeza agustiniana pasa al sermón gelasiano: *et cordi meo multum tristitiae intulit et plurimum timoris incussit* (c. 1), al recordar la rareza de los pocos asistentes a la descuidada devoción religiosa.

Otro sermón de san Agustín, para la misma festividad de los apóstoles Pedro y Pablo, aborda el tema de las devastaciones de Roma: *Ecce quando faciebamus sacrificia diis nostris, stabat Roma, florebat Roma; modo . . . ecce quid patitur Roma . . . Semel a Gallis sic incensa est, ut solus collis Capitolinus remaneret . . .* (*Sermo 296, c. 6, n. 7: PL 38, 1336*); y más abajo, después de citar el flagelo (Hebr. 12, 6) pregunta: *Debuit ergo apostolorum memoria, per quam tibi preparatur caelum, servare tibi in terra theatra insanorum?* (*ibid., c. 9, n. 10*). Gelasio conocía el pasaje agustiniano y utiliza el esquema en la carta contra las Lupercales: *Numquid . . . a Gallis Roma non capta est . . .?* (*Lup. 25a*). En el sermón, la cita agustiniana del flagelo paulino le sugiere el empleo de otro azote más enérgico: *Vereor igitur, dilectissimi, ne vox illa prophetica tales increpasse videatur, quae dicit: Flagellasti eos, et non doluerunt; castigasti eos, et noluerunt accipere disciplinam* (c. 1). Las expresiones del obispo de Hipona (*maiore frequentia celebrare, theatra insanorum*) aparecen fusionadas en la frase gelasiana del sermón: *maiorem obtinent frequentiam insana spectacula quam beata martyria* (c. 1).

III

El castigo de Roma y las «sacramentorum prefationes»

En la edición de la *Opera Omnia* de san León el Grande, los hermanos Ballerini resaltaron la analogía del sermón 84 con el prefacio de la misa XXIII de la fiesta de san Pedro y san Pablo, en el *Sacramentarium Leonianum (Veronense)*. G. Morin pensó que podrían haber sido esparcidas las plegarias del formulario de la fiesta conmemorativa entre las misas interminables del 29 de

junio, del mes de julio o del mes de septiembre¹. Más cauto se muestra E. Bourque, reconociendo lo peligroso de establecer la datación por dichas analogías, las cuales, según él, no son tan acentuadas².

La atribución del *De neglecta solemnitate* al papa Gelasio I abre nuevas perspectivas al examen comparativo con sus *sacramentorum prefationes*. Después del estudio de G. Pomarès³, el investigador cuenta con un excelente subsidio para la exploración de los *libelli missae* del *Sacramentarium Veronense*. Por mi parte, ya en 1958 propuse identificar, en la famosa compilación, la obra gelasiana⁴.

En realidad, nuestro sermón nos permite adentrarnos en los formularios que hablan de guerra y calamidades de Roma, lo mismo que la carta de las Luperciales sirvió de hilo conductor para identificar abundantes oraciones y prefacios gelasianos. Aquí me limito a cotejar un haz de ideas clave para su interpretación.

a) La *castigatio* de Roma

En los sermones leonianos es frecuente el empleo de *castigatio*, en su acepción de abstinencia o de mortificación corporal ascética. En cambio, Gelasio la emplea en el sentido de castigo divino: *diem castigationis et liberationis nostrae* (c. 1), como la cita de Jeremías 5,3 (*castigasti eos*). Con idéntico estilo aparece en un lote de plegarias:

- *Deus qui diligendo castigas et castigando nos refoves* (Ve 1061)⁵
- *VD: qui nos castigando sanas et refoendo benignus erudis, dum maris salvos esse correctos quam perire neglectos* (Ve 465)
- *Parce dñe populo tuo, ut dignis flagellationibus castigatus, in tua miseratione respiret* (Ve 509)
- *malis potius praesentibus castigatos... providentiae tuae beneficia cognoscentes* (Ve 308).

Como puede apreciarse, los textos litúrgicos no sólo emplean la *castigatio* en el mismo sentido que el sermón de Gelasio, sino que

¹ Véase más arriba, p. 249, nota 1.

² E. Bourque, *Etude sur les sacramentaires romains. Les textes primitif* (Roma, 1948) p. 117, nota 3. ³ Véase más arriba, p. 250, la nota 1.

⁴ J. Janini, El gelasiano «*De missarum solemnitiis*»: *Hispania sacra* 11, 1958, 83–105.

⁵ Cito los textos litúrgicos según la edición Mohlberg–Eizenhöfer–Siffrin, *Sacramentarium Veronense* (Roma, 1956); los números se refieren a las fórmulas.

utilizan también idéntica terminología: el flagelo, la corrección, la negligencia, el reconocimiento de los divinos beneficios.

b) Las amenazas proféticas

En el sermón, el papa teme *ne vox illa prophetica tales increpasse videatur, quae dicit . . .* (Jer. 5,3). También en un prefacio emplea Gelasio idéntica expresión para recordar al pueblo de Roma las proféticas amenazas:

— *agnoscimus, sicut profetica dudum voce testatus es, ad peccantium merita pertinere, ut servorum tuorum labore quoedita sub conspectu nostro manibus diripiantur alienis, et quae desudantibus famulis nasci tribuis, ab hostibus patiaris absumi* (Ve 446).

Evidentemente, el papa ha dado *cursus litúrgico* a los siguientes pasajes bíblicos: Ez. 7,21: *et dabo illud in manus alienorum ad diripiendum, et impiis terrae in praedam;* Ps. 108,11: *et diripiunt alieni labores eius;* Lev. 26, 16: *ego quoque haec faciam vobis: visitabo vos velociter in egestate et ardore . . . frustra seretis semen tem, quae ab hostibus devorabitur.* Por eso, no pueden en modo alguno identificarse, como pretendió Duchesne¹, las huestes de Vitiges con los *hostes* del Levítico que devorarán las cosechas². Por lo demás, el formulario es característicamente gelasiano.

c) El culto a los apóstoles

En el sermón, el papa echaba en cara al pueblo romano el honrar más a los demonios que a los apóstoles: *plus impenditur daemonis quam apostolis.* En la liturgia, abundan las misas de san Pedro y san Pablo y entre ellas hay muchas de estilo genuino de Gelasio I:

— *Peractis sollemniter dñe quae pro apostolorum tuorum beata celebravimus passione, ipsorum, quesumus, nobis fiant intercessione salutaria, in quorum nataliciis sunt exultanter impensa* (Ve 311).

La ingratitud de los romanos hacia sus apóstoles y sus mártires era tanto más reprobable, cuanto en los peligros de la Urbe eran éstos y no el *ludus Circensium* quienes habían detenido la

¹ L. Duchesne, *Origines du culte chrétien*, 5 ed. (París, 1925) pp. 145–146.

² La cita Lev. 26, 16 corresponde al texto de la pág. 60, lín. 21, en la edición Mohlberg, *Sacramentarium Veronense* (Roma, 1956), pero no figura en el índice de «Schriftstellen und Schriftanklänge» p. 231.

divina sentencia. Es, pues, lógico que afloren idénticos ideas en el prefacio de la missa XXIII del mes de junio:

VD: qui praevidens quantis nostra civitas laboratura esset incommodis, apostolici roboris in eadem praecipua membra posuisti. Sed o felix si tuos presules, Romana cognosceres et tantos dignae studieris celebrare rectiores. Nulli te hostes impeterent, nulla prorsus terrent . . . (Ve 361)

Este prefacio, lo mismo que el sermón y la carta contra las Lupercales, recoge un eco de la predicación de san Agustín. El obispo de Hipona arguye a los que no ven en Roma la memoria de los apóstoles:

Iacet Petri corpus Romae . . . ei misera est Roma, et vastatur Roma, affligitur, conteritur, incenditur. Tot strages mortis fiunt per famem, per pestem, per gladium; ubi sunt Memoria apostolorum? Quid dicio? Ecce hoc dixi, Tanta mala Roma patitur, ubi sunt Memoria apostolorum? Ibi sunt, sed in te non sunt. Utinam in te essent . . . (Sermo 296, c. 5, n. 6: PL 38, 1355).

Habilmente recogió Gelasio la idea agustiniana en el bello prefacio: *Sed o felix si tuos presules, Romana cognosceres . . .* En realidad, los últimos decenios del siglo V fueron muy críticos para Roma. Quizá Gelasio redactara ya algunos *libelli missae* durante los pontificados de Simplicio y Félix III, a quienes sirvió. Luego, los colecciónó a lo largo de las secciones de julio, septiembre y en la fiesta de los santos apóstoles Pedro y Pablo. Son esos formularios que nos hablan del peligro de guerras, del temor a los enemigos, al hambre, a las calamidades que acechaban cuando los bárbaros se enseñareaban del suelo de Italia¹.

d) Los peligros de la ingratitud

Gran peligro, dice el sermón, es que los hombres sean ingratos a Dios y olviden su beneficios (c. 1). La misma idea, asociando la ingratitud y los beneficios, aparece en un prefacio de los ayunos de Tímporas: *ne conlatis ingrati beneficiis conferendis probemur indigni* (Ve 1030 = Ve 935).

En todas las fórmulas que he citado, el contexto del formulario está repleto de expresiones gelasianas. Es lógico que así suceda, dada la actividad litúrgica del papa, cuyas *sacramentorum prefa-*

¹ Gelasio I, Ep. 14, ed. Thiel 362 (PL 59, 48 D): *Per diversas Italiae partes ita belli famisque consumpeit incurso. El mismo Gelasio, según el Liber pontificalis, liberavit a periculo famis civitatem Romanam.*

tiones permiten desvelar el misterio de los antiguos *libelli* romanos del siglo¹. La depuración crítica de los sermones de san León el Grande, eliminando los supositicios, podrá hacer avanzar la identificación de formularios de sus sucesores. El caso del *De neglecta solemnitate* incita a continuar las tareas en ese sentido.

¹ Remito a mi artículo S. León y las misas del Bautista: *Anales del Seminario de Valencia* 3, 1962, 123-201.

The Bithynian Christians' *Carmen Christo*

R. P. MARTIN, Manchester

The letter of the Roman official Pliny, who was legate to the province of Bithynia and Pontus in A. D. 111–112, contains what purports to be an eye-witness account of the Sunday morning worship of the Church in Asia Minor in the early part of the second century¹. Included in the description of the Christians' *synaxis* is the notice that they offered a *carmen* to Christ as their cultic God (*carmenque Christo quasi deo dicere secum inuicem*).

The purpose of this paper is to pass under review the different meanings which have been assigned to the term *carmen* in the phrase of Pliny's text.

I. Some writers hold that *carmen* means an Old Testament psalm. This view is taken mainly on the assumption that the Bithynian Christians had apparently incorporated into their worship the chief elements of the Jewish Sabbath service. C. J. Kraemer notes that *sacramentum* ('they bound themselves by *an oath*') is parallel with the Decalogue confession; and he wishes to refer the *carmen* to a psalm borrowed from the Jewish psalter². The phrase *secum inuicem* is relevant, for it is claimed that the antiphonal singing of psalms was part of the *pietas Judaica* of synagogue worship and was borrowed by Christians from this source³. But this connection is debatable. Although antiphonal responses were used by the congregation in the Hebrew synagogues of the first century, the evidence for congregational psalm-

¹ The historical background is given in E. C. Kennedy, *Martial and Pliny*, Oxford 1952, ad X. 96; and B. J. Kidd, *A History of the Church to A. D. 461*, I, Oxford 1922, 234 ff.

² C. J. Kraemer, *Pliny and the Early Christian Church Service*, *The Journal of Classical Philology*, 29, 1934, 293–300.

³ Cf. W. O. E. Oesterley, *The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy*, Oxford 1925, 75.

singing is slender¹. It is possible, however, that the Hellenistic synagogues of the Diaspora were more developed in the use of psalmody than the Palestinian synagogues². And we know, from the witness of Justin and Tertullian, that the Psalms were adapted to Christian purposes³. But it is difficult to account for *secum inuicem* on the supposition that the Bithynian *carmen* was an Old Testament text.

S. L. Mohler has proposed that *carmen* refers to a Christianized version of the Jewish confession of faith, known as the *Shema'*⁴. The evidence that the *Shema'* was recited antiphonally in the synagogue liturgy is better attested than the practice of psalm-singing⁵. Both liturgical prayer and the confession of faith were led by the representative of the assembly, the *š'liāh sibbûr* (*שְׁלִיחַ סִבּוּר*), as part of his liturgical function⁶. The congregation responded with Amen and certain short *b'rākōt*, in an antiphonal manner. But there seems little support for this suggested meaning of *carmen* in the context of Christian worship apart from the common practice of antiphons.

II. J. B. Lightfoot accepts that the sense of *secum inuicem* implies antiphonal responses, but remarks that *carmen* can be used of 'any set form of words', and does not necessarily presuppose a metrical composition⁷. J. Stevenson takes over this alter-

¹ So I. Elbogen, Der jüdische Gottesdienst in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung⁴, Hildesheim 1962, reprint, 249, 494 ff.; W. Bauer, Der Wortgottesdienst der ältesten Christen. Sammlung gemeinverständlicher Vorträge und Schriften aus dem Gebiet der Theologie und Religionsgeschichte, 148, Tübingen 1930, 21; and H. Lietzmann, The Beginnings of the Christian Church, E. T., London 1949, 148.

² See H. Lietzmann, op. cit. 148 and earlier 101–103.

³ Justin, Dialogue with Trypho 63 (PG 6, 621 f.). Cf. A. L. Williams, Justin Martyr: The Dialogue with Trypho, London 1930, 132. Justin speaks of Ps. 45 and 110 as having been adapted for Christian worship, while Tertullian mentions that Ps. 133 was sung at the Agape meal (*De ieunio* 13; PL 2, 1024). 'It is possible that the reference to the singing of Ps. 34 (in the Liturgy of St. James) at the Eucharist service is also a witness to the singing of the Old Testament Psalms in the second century' comments W. S. Smith, Musical Aspects of the New Testament, Amsterdam 1962, 66.

⁴ S. L. Mohler, 'The Bithynian Christians Again', The Journal of Classical Philology, 30, 1935, 167–169.

⁵ For the use of the *Shema'* cf. E. Schürer, History of the Jewish People, E. T. II 2, Edinburgh 1893, 77 ff.

⁶ For the office of *š'liāh sibbûr* see Strack-Billerbeck, Kommentar z. N. T., Munich 1922–1928, IV, 149–152; I. Elbogen, op. cit. 487 ff.

⁷ J. B. Lightfoot, Ignatius, The Apostolic Fathers II 1, London 1889, 31.

native in his adaptation of H. M. Gwatkin's translation of Pliny's words. He renders them as 'recite by turns a form of words'¹.

A special significance is attached to this understanding of the text by H. Lietzmann who endeavoured to place the words in a baptismal context. *Carmen... dicere*, he says, signifies the 'question and answer of a formulated baptismal confession'². The grounds for this novel interpretation, which has been accepted by some recent Continental scholars (notably W. Nauck)³, are three. First, Lietzmann quotes two pieces of evidence in which *carmen* is used to mean a baptismal symbol⁴. Then, the phrase *secum inuicem* may be understood as the *interrogatio de fide* and the baptizand's *responsum*, as in the early baptismal formularies⁵. Thirdly, Lietzmann is able to account for the ambiguity of *carmen* by observing that it also carries the sense of a magical incantation or invocation. What to the Bithynian Christians was a cherished symbol and badge of their faith seemed to the pagan legate a mere charm or incantation.

III. This view of Lietzmann's is opposed by F. J. Dölger in his full study of the term⁶. The merit of Dölger's later conclusion – he formerly followed Lietzmann⁷ – is that it explains both the implicit interrogation of Pliny and the Christians' response thereto. Pliny asks if the Christians worship idolatrously and offer *preces infelices* which are subversive of the state in their tendency. The Christians strenuously rebut these implied charges: 'Our

¹ J. Stevenson, *The New Eusebius*, London 1957, 14f. adapting H. M. Gwatkin, *Selections from Early Christian Writers*, London 1902, 29.

² H. Lietzmann, *Die liturgischen Angaben des Plinius*, *Geschichtliche Studien Albert Hauck zum 70. Geburtstag*, Leipzig 1916, 34–38 (37). Cf. F. Kattenbusch, *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 45, 1920, 224.

³ W. Nauck, *Die Tradition und der Charakter des ersten Johannesbriefes*, *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum N. T. 3*, Tübingen 1957, 161 ff. Those who follow Lietzmann's reconstruction are listed by Nauck, op. cit. 161 note 4.

⁴ Lietzmann, loc. cit., citing *Rhein. Museum* 71, 1916, 281f., and *Faustus v. Reji I* 1 and *Acta Arcelli Papae* § 4.

⁵ For specimens of this 'question and answer' formulation, see Hahn's reference work, A. and G. L. Hahn, *Bibliothek der Symbole und Glaubensregeln der alten Kirche*, Hildesheim 1962, reprint, § 31a.

⁶ F. J. Dölger, *Das an Christus gerichtete Carmen der Christen Bithyniens, Sol Salutis: Gebet und Gesang im christlichen Altertum*, *Liturgiegeschichtliche Forschungen* 16/17 (4/5) Münster 1925, 103–136.

⁷ F. J. Dölger, *Die Sonne der Gerechtigkeit*, *Liturgiegeschichtliche Forschungen* 14 (2), Münster 1919, 116.

carmen is directed to no unlawful gods, or magical spirits, or dead deities. We call upon the living Christ'. The true meaning of *carmen*, Dölger avers, is therefore *supplicatio*. He concludes: 'What Pliny ascertained from the cross-examination was an invocation of Jesus' (eine Anrufung Jesu)¹. Such an invocation may have been either a hymn or a solemn prose formula. — Dölger, who leaves this an open issue, inclines to the former alternative. But the invocation must have been accompanied by a response because *secum inuicem*, which he translates as 'reciprocally' (wechselseits), implies a response to the ejaculation.

Other commentators on the Pliny text have sought to suggest what this response may have been. Some think that the Christians repeated the invocation as they were being instructed by their catechetical teacher. Newman and Dom Connolly take this view. The latter² renders: They repeated 'among themselves an invocation of Christ'. W. Lockton³ thought more of a liturgical response, and submitted that, in answer to the *carmen* offered by the leader, the assembled company replied: 'Lord, have mercy' (*Kyrie eleison*). Dölger⁴ took the same line of interpretation, and imagined that the *carmen* was 'a hymn to Christ as God' (ein Gesang an Christus als Gott), recited by bishop, priest or deacon, and evoking some such catena of response as:

Come, Lord Jesus!
Mārānd thā (i. e. our Lord, come!)
 σῶσον ἡμᾶς
 ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς
 κύριε ἐλέησον

with additional ejaculations like Amen, Hallelujah.

These suggestions can be considered only as speculative. There is no way of testing their accuracy; and it seems better to admit that we do not know the nature of the *carmen* and the response which it called forth, although it is possible that in both canonical (1 Cor. 16. 22–24; Apoc. 22. 17–21) and extra-canonical (Didache

¹ Dölger, op. cit. 115.

² Cited, without reference, by J. H. Srawley, *The Early History of the Liturgy*², Cambridge 1947, 30.

³ W. Lockton, *Journal of Theological Studies* 16, 1915, 550.

⁴ Dölger, loc. cit. 135–136.

10.6) sources¹ there is evidence of a liturgical dialogue between the presiding minister (or celebrant at the Eucharist) and the congregation.

IV. If *carmen* carries the sense of a composition, whether as a metrical hymn to be sung or as a form of words in prose, can we be sure that it was only a single invocatory sentence or litany? O. Casel² refuses so to regard it, and wishes to understand the word not according to its Latin usage but as a transcription of the Greek *ὕμνος*. Dölger³ has objected to this equivalence on the double ground that 'the cultural and historical background... makes our criterion (for deciding the meaning of *carmen*) Roman legal speech' and 'Even if Pliny had wanted to render the Greek *ὕμνος* faithfully, why then did he not use the word *hymnus* which in the Latin of his time had already become common?'. But Dölger gives only one footnote reference to the use of *hymnus*; and the attestation of this word in the lexica is exiguous. It may well be that Pliny chose to use the word which was most familiar to him; and it may be submitted that the Greek *ὕμνος* underlies the Latin of Pliny's report. Eusebius uses the cognate verb *ὕμνεῖν* in his account of the incident.⁴

The conclusion⁵ that *carmen* means a hymn addressed to Christ and intended to be sung has been challenged by those who

¹ Both G. Bornkamm, *Das Anathema in der urchristlichen Abendmahlstugie*, reprinted in *Das Ende des Gesetzes: Paulusstudien. Gesammelte Aufsätze I. Beitr. z. evangelischen Theologie N. F. 16*, München 1961, 123–132 and J. A. T. Robinson, *The Earliest Christian Liturgical Sequence?*, reprinted in *Twelve New Testament Studies. Studies in Biblical Theology No. 34*, London 1962, 154–157 have noted the similarity between 1 Cor. 16.22 and Didache 10.6. 'Beide Texte sind hinsichtlich ihrer sakral-rechtlichen Stilisierung und ihrem Inhalt nach eng verwandt', comments Bornkamm (*loc. cit.* 123). Both scholars accept the conclusion of H. Lietzmann, *Mass and Lord's Supper*, E. T. Fasc. 4, Leiden 1953, 192f. that Didache 10.6 is set in the shape of a dialogue between the Celebrant and the congregation at the Eucharist.

A dialogue pattern in Apoc. 22.17–21 is detected by J. A. T. Robinson, *loc. cit.* 156f.

But this background of 1 Cor. 16 is open to certain objections. See C. F. D. Moule, *A Reconsideration of the context of Maranatha*, *New Testament Studies 6*, 1960, 307–310.

² O. Casel, review of Dölger's *Sol Salutis*, *Theol. Revue* 20, 1921, 183.

³ Dölger, *loc. cit.* 116f.

⁴ Eusebius, *H. E. III* 33, 1–3.

⁵ This conclusion is accepted by most translators and by J. Quasten, *Carmen*, in *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum II* 907: *carmen* is no magical formula, but a composition directed to Christ as God; and D. M. Stanley,

prefer to translate *carmen* as 'a form of words', and to regard the corresponding verb as meaning that this form of words was recited, not sung. This translation is based on the plain meaning of *dicere* (= 'to say', 'to declare'); and accepts the alternative sense of *carmen* as 'formula', 'declaration'. But there are two points which tell against this interpretation.

First, whatever the phrase *carmen . . . dicere* may have meant to Pliny (and we have no private access to his mind), it is indisputable that the earliest 'commentator' on this text, Tertullian in his reference to it in *Apol.* 2.6, believed that a hymnic composition was intended, as his use of the verb *canere* shows in his re-casting of the sentence as *ad canendum Christo ut deo*¹. And the meaning of *canere* is shown in other references Tertullian makes². The force of this piece of evidence is recognized by Nauck when he writes³: 'Even though Lietzmann has two references to show that the Christian regarded his baptismal profession as his *carmen* . . . yet the possibility of the true meaning of *carmen* as a song or hymn must at least remain open, since it was certainly so understood by Tertullian'.

The second method of finding out the precise connotation of *carmen* . . . *dicere* is one which has been strangely overlooked. This is the enquiry into the usage in Latin authors. The chief authority is Horace who uses the noun and verb on two occasions.

In Carmen saeculare

and in *Liber IV: Carmen XII: ad Virgilium:*

Carmenque Christo quasi Deo dicere, Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 20, 1958, 173-191: 'The phrase *carmen* etc., which might seem to suggest choral recitation of the psalter, undoubtedly is an attempt to express the liturgical practice . . . of community hymn-singing' (176).

¹ See the commentary of T. H. Bindley in his edition of the *Apologeticus*, 1889, 9. The reading *Christo et deo* is to be rejected.

² Tertullian, Apol. 39. He uses *carmen* of a hymn in de Orat. 27, and gives further references to Christian psalmody in ad Uxor. 2. 8 and Exhort. ad Cast. 10.

³ W. Nauck, op. cit. 161 note 5.

They are singing as they lie on the yielding grass
 Keeping their fattening sheep and playing their pipes
*(Dicunt in tenero gramine pinguium
 Custodes ovium carmina fistula)*

(lines 9,10)¹

the phrase is employed and in both instances the meaning is 'to sing a song'.

Both the Latin usage and later Christian comment endorse the conviction that *carmen Christo . . . dicere* is an allusion to the practice of the hymnic adoration of Christ as cultic God². The Bithynian Christians, we learn, had it as their custom to hail Him as their cult divinity; to set Him at the centre of their worship as they brought their homage to Him; and to do so in a way – by the offering of a *carmen* to Him – which became a regular feature of later Christian worship as Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria and Eusebius confirm³. In spite of many ingenious attempts to discover cryptic meanings in the text, the simplest translation seems the best. The Christians met 'to chant verses alternately amongst themselves in honour of Christ as if to a god'⁴.

¹ The translations of Horace are those of J. P. Clancy, *The Odes and Epodes of Horace*, University of Chicago 1960, 188, 180.

² On the subject of worship offered to Jesus, cf. J. M. Nielsen, *Gebet und Gottesdienst im Neuen Testament*, Freiburg 1937, 163ff.

³ Tertullian, *ad Uxor.* 2,8; Clement, *Strom.* VII, 7, 49; *idem, Exhort. ad pat.* (GCS III, p. 222, 30 Stählin). Cf. Origen, *Contra Celsum*, 7, 67 and Socrates H. E. 6, 8. Eusebius, H. E. V 38, 5.

⁴ This is the translation of B. Radice, *The Letters of the Younger Pliny* (Penguin ed.) Harmondsworth 1963, 294.

‘Apostolic Tradition’: Questions Concerning the Appointment of the Bishop

E. C. RATCLIFF, Cambridge

Who, according to the author of ‘Apostolic Tradition’, were to select a bishop? Who were qualified, or unqualified, for selection? By what act was the appointment of the bishop effected? A problem appears, when the relevant texts are compared. The texts fall into two groups.

(a) Latin: *Episcopus ordinetur electus ab omni populo*¹.

(b) Greek. [Apostolic Constitutions VIII, 4.2]: ‘Ἐπίσκοπον χειροτονεῖσθαι, ὡς ἐν τοῖς προλαβοῦσιν . . . διεταξάμεθα, ἐν πᾶσι ἀμεμπτον, ὑπὸ παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ ἐκλεγμένον’² (Epitome III adds ἄριστον, after ἀμεμπτον³).

(c) Syriac. [Testamentum Domini 1,20]: ‘Let the bishop be appointed, being chosen out by (*men*) all the people, according to the will of the holy spirit.’⁴

2 (a) Ethiopic [Statutes of the Apostles 22]: ‘When a bishop is to be appointed, as we have already said, one who has been chosen from (*em*) all the people.’⁵

(b) Sahidic [Canons of our holy Fathers the Apostles 64]: ‘The bishop is to be appointed according to the word which we said previously, having been chosen from (*ebol hem*) the whole multitude and being without sin.’⁶

¹ E. Hauler, *Didascaliae Apostolorum Fragmenta Ueronensia Latina. Accedunt Canonum qui dicuntur Apostolorum et Aegyptiorum Reliquiae*, Lipsiae 1900, p. 103.

² F. X. Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum*, Paderbornae 1905, Vol. I, p. 472.

³ Ibid. Vol. II, p. 77.

⁴ I. E. Rahmani, *Testamentum Domini Nostri Iesu Christi*, Moguntiae 1899, pp. 26.27.

⁵ H. Duensing, *Der aethiopische Text der Kirchenordnung des Hippolyt*, Göttingen 1946, pp. 16.17.

⁶ W. Till and J. Leipoldt, *Der koptische Text der Kirchenordnung Hippolyts*, Berlin 1954, pp. 2, 3.

(c) Arabic [Canons of the Apostles 21]: '*L'évêque sera ordonné comme nous l'avons déjà dit. Il sera choisi parmi (min) toute l'assemblée des fidèles, et exempt de péché*'.¹

It will be noticed that the texts in Group 1 contemplate choice 'by' (*ὑπό*) the 'people' (*λαός*), whereas the texts in Group 2 envisage choice 'from among' (*ἐν*) the people, or 'multitude' or 'assembly' (*πλῆθος*). Although *ὑπό* has the authority of the Latin version, there is such strong support for *ἐν* from the Ethiopic and its cognates, that the authenticity of *ὑπό* cannot be taken for granted. Further, the two prepositions represent a difference between choices. *ὑπό* leaves the people unfettered. *ἐν* introduces a limitation. It is possible to interpret *ἐν* as restricting the field of choice either to the laity, and so debarring deacons and presbyters; or to the local Church, and so excluding persons from another Church. The texts offer no clue as to which interpretation should be accepted. With the exception of 1 (c), however, and the possible exception of 1 (a), the texts do not profess to be, and are not intended to be taken as, complete.

It will have been remarked that all the texts of Group 2 refer to a direction previously given, 'as we have already said'. 1 (b), both Apostolic Constitutions VIII, 4,2, and Epitome III, are in agreement; the bishop is to be appointed *ώς ἐν τοῖς προλαβοῦσιν . . . διεταξάμεθα*. The equivalent of the phrase recurs in the direction given for the appointment of deacons in *Testamentum Domini*² and in the documents of Group 2. It occurs also in the Latin version, '*Diaconus vero, cum ordinatur, eligatur secundum ea, quae praedicta sunt.*'³ Presumably, then, the phrase, *ώς ἐν τοῖς προλαβοῦσιν*, may be counted as belonging to the original Greek. Bishops and deacons alike were to be chosen in accordance with a procedure laid down in a preceding passage. Where was the reader to look for the passage? There was clearly no place for it in Apostolic Tradition. The answer cannot be in doubt. *τὰ προλαβόντα* were to be found in the author's preceding treatise, *Περὶ χρησμάτων*.

The direction concerning the appointment of a bishop is no longer available, having been lost with the great part of *Περὶ*

¹ J. and A. Périer, Les "127 Canons des Apôtres", *Patrologia Orientalis*, t. VIII, Paris 1912, p. 590.

² I. E. Rahmani, op. cit., pp. 78, 79.

³ E. Haurer, op. cit., p. 109.

χαρισμάτων. Speculation is always open to a charge of fancifulness; nevertheless it is tempting to think that Apostolic Constitutions VIII, 4 and Epitome III, IV may contain a hint of the tenor of the direction. The bishop's ordination prayer addresses the Lord as *χαρδιογνῶστα πάντων*, and refers to the bishop as *δύ ἐξελέξω εἰς ἐπισκοπήν σου τὴν ἀγίαν*¹. We catch an echo from the account of the choice of Matthias to be an apostle, set down in Acts 1, 23–26. The ceremony accompanying the prayer is of particular interest. Apostolic Constitutions and Epitome describe it as follows:

καὶ σιωπῆς γενομένης εἰς τῶν πρώτων ἐπισκόπων ἅμα καὶ δυσὶν ἑτέροις πλησίον τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου ἔστως, τῶν λοιπῶν ἐπισκόπων καὶ πρεσβυτέρων σιωπῇ προσευχομένων, τῶν δὲ διακόνων τὰ θεῖα εὐαγγέλια ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ χειροτονούμενον κεφαλῆς ἀνεπτυγμένα κατεχόντων, λεγέτω πρὸς θεόν². (The ordination prayer follows.)

The ceremony of the Gospel Book has no parallel in any of the cognate documents. Dom B. Botte has described the ceremony as *le seul élément original* contributed by Apostolic Constitutions³. But there is another element, or absence of an element, which, in the light of the other documents, may also be described as 'original'. Neither the bishop who recites the prayer nor his silent colleagues lay their hands upon the person being ordained. We are reminded again of the appointment of Matthias; the apostle received no *ἐπιθεσίς* τῶν χειρῶν. What, then, is the significance of the Gospel Book? We must turn once more to the narrative of Acts 1, 23–26. When the apostolic vacancy was to be filled, 'they put up' (*ἔστησαν*) two men, Joseph Barsabbas and Matthias. Then prayer was made to the Lord, 'Knower of the hearts of all men', to show which of the two He had chosen for the apostleship. Next, 'lots' were 'given' for ascertaining the Lord's choice. The lot indicated Matthias to be the choice; and Matthias was forthwith counted an apostle. The giving of the lots was indisputably

¹ So Epitome IV; Ap. Const. reads *χαρδιογ*. Θεός, and *εἰς ἐπίσκοπον*. It is generally accepted that the text of the prayer preserved in Epitome is purer than that found in Ap. Const.

² F. X. Funk, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 472; Vol. II, p. 78.

³ In a paper entitled 'L'Ordre d'après les Prières d'Ordination' contributed to *Études sur le Sacrement de l'Ordre*, Lex Orandi 22, Paris, 1957, p. 22. The ceremony was practiced at Antioch in Chrysostom's time, Dialogue of Palladius XVI. Severianus of Gabala also refers to it (J. A. Cramer, *Catena in Acta SS. Apostolorum*, Oxford 1838, pp. 22f. and 426); and it was known to Ps-Dionysius the Areopagite, Ecclesiastical Hierarchy V 2.

the decisive element in the proceedings. Acts is silent, however, about the method of the lot-giving. Whatever it was, it was clearly held to be an act of *μαρτελα*. Did the Gospels figure in an act of 'Evangeliomancy'? If they did, an explanation of the open Gospel Book readily suggests itself. The Book would be open at the passage which had indicated the Lord's choice of the bishop.

Is it possible that, beneath the layers of rearrangement, adjustment, and retouching to which Apostolic Tradition has been subjected¹, we can discern a procedure for choosing a bishop, framed upon the apostolic model of Acts 1, 23–26? There is admittedly too little evidence to enable the question to be answered with an unhesitating affirmative. Yet there is nothing intrinsically impossible about the notion. The author of '*Ἀποστολικὴ Παράδοσις*' was professedly interested in apostolic tradition, and the assertion of that tradition in practice was his declared purpose. Further, the implications of the notion are consistent with the ideas expressed in the surviving fragments of *Περὶ χαρισμάτων* and in particular of its chapter or chapters *περὶ χειροτονίῶν*. From these fragments², revised and redacted though they may be, we gather that the basic thought of the treatise was the Pauline teaching of 1 Corinthians 12, 4–11, *Διαιρέσεις δὲ χαρισμάτων εἰσίν. τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα· καὶ διαιρέσεις διακονιῶν εἰσιν, καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς κύριος· καὶ διαιρέσεις ἐνεργημάτων εἰσίν, δὲ δὲ αὐτὸς θεός ὁ ἐνεργῶν τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν . . . πάντα δὲ ταῦτα ἐνεργεῖ τὸ ἐν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα, διαιροῦν ιδίᾳ ἔκαστῳ καθὼς βούλεται.* The charismata of the Spirit are given by God, for the needs of the Church, as He wills, and cannot be acquired by men at their wish. Applied in the sphere of ordinations, this principle is interpreted to mean that the charismata of the diaconate and presbyterate are final for those on whom God has bestowed them. There can be no movement to a higher order³: '*Ἐκεῖνο . . . παραγγέλλο-*

¹ The bishop's ordination prayer has undergone considerable revision so as to be conformed to the standards and usage of the 4th century. To examine it, however, and to discuss the several forms of the rite in which it occurs is outside the scope of this paper.

² The principal fragments are Ap. Const. VIII, 1,2 and 46; cf. Epitome I, II and XXVIII. (F. X. Funk, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 460–471 and 557–563; Vol. II, pp. 72–77 and 92–96).

³ It is noteworthy that the version of the deacon's ordination prayer contained in *Testamentum Domini* asks only that 'ministering without blame . . . he may be worthy of this high and exalted degree' (I. E. Rahmani, op. cit.,

μεν' ἔκαστον ἐμμένειν τῇ τάξιν τῇ δοθείσῃ αὐτῷ καὶ μὴ ὑπερβαίνειν τοὺς δρους· οὐ γάρ εἰσιν ἡμέτεροι, ἀλλὰ τοῦ θεοῦ¹. Here, it would seem, we have the answer which the author of Apostolic Tradition would make to the questions posed at the beginning of this paper. A bishop cannot be taken from among the deacons or the presbyters; he must be taken from the *λαός* or *πλῆθος*. No doubt it is the right and function of the *λαός* to 'put up' (*έσταναι*) any whom they believe to be morally and spiritually 'vescovabili'. But because God only can give the charismata requisite for His holy *ἐπισκοπή*, to Him alone belongs the choice and appointment of the bishop.

If the theory propounded in this paper commends itself as being not improbable, at least two inferences may be drawn from it. They may be mentioned in conclusion. First, as the author of Apostolic Tradition regarded the matter, the appointment of a bishop did not demand as of necessity the active assistance, or even the presence, of other bishops. 'Evangeliomancy' could be conducted by presbyters. Indeed, discernible between the lines of the several versions of Apostolic Tradition, there are signs which can be taken as indicating that, in its original form, the direction instructed the presbyters to conduct the proceedings. The second inference is related to the first. If the author of Apostolic Tradition thought about apostolic succession, he did not think of it as a 'sacramental succession' or in terms of chain or series. He thought of the bishop as succeeding, by an immediate appointment of the Lord, to an apostolic vacancy, and so to an immediate apostolic relationship with the Lord, as Matthias had done.

pp. 92, 93), whereas in the other documents the prayer asks that 'ministering blamelessly', he 'may be judged worthy of a more exalted degree', cf. Ap. Const. VIII, 18,3 (F. X. Funk, *ibid.*, p. 525).

¹ Ap. Const. VIII, 46,1; Epitome XXVIII, 1 (F. X. Funk, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 557; vol. II, p. 92).

Dramatic Dimension in Byzantine Hymns

R. J. SCHORK, Washington

An observer might be led to suspect that there are few questions in the study of the customs and literature of the Eastern Church more controversial than that of the existence of Greek religious drama. For example, Baud-Bovy asserts, "*Byzance n'a pas connu de théâtre religieux*"¹; Bréhier counters, "*Ce qui est certain, c'est que le drame religieux avait fini par constituer un genre littéraire distinct, avec ses lois propres et sa tradition.*"² Mutually exclusive statements such as these could confuse non-specialists who attempt to survey the history of drama from classical through medieval to modern times. I must immediately add that the controversy has been perpetuated, generally speaking, because no one has systematically refuted his opponents' contentions.

The essence of the *status quaestionis* is today much the same as it was in 1936 when George La Piana published a comprehensive review of the pertinent literature³. In that article La Piana urged that future research be focused on what he considered to be the primary source material for evidence of a continuous dramatic tradition in the Byzantine Church: the so-called "dramatic homilies." Concealed in these works, La Piana wrote, is fragmentary but convincing testimony for true drama at an early date, 5th and 6th century — drama distinct from but not

¹ S. Baud-Bovy, 'Sur un sacrifice d'Abraham de Romanos et sur l'existence d'un théâtre religieux à Byzance', *Byzantion* 13, 1938, 333.

² L. Bréhier, *Le Monde byzantin III (La civilisation byzantine)*, Paris 1950, 416.

³ G. La Piana, 'The Byzantine Theatre', *Speculum* 11, 1936, 171–211. In this article La Piana rehearses the argument of his book *Le Rappresentazioni Sacre nella Letteratura Bizantina dalle Origini al Secolo IX*, Grottaferrata 1912, to expose the defects of V. Cottas, *Le Théâtre à Byzance*, Paris 1931. Cf. Maas' review of V. Cottas' book in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 32, 1932, 395.

unconnected with the rhythmic prose sermon. Banked in monasteries the memory and texts of these seedlings of genuine religious theatre weathered the Iconoclastic Period and reappeared, now transformed into "homiletic compositions under various titles and attributed to various ancient authors." Later (perhaps in the 11th century) religious drama was re-established, though here again the evidence is indirect. At any rate, the text of a scenario for a Cyprus Passion Cycle¹, dated in the mid-13th century, has survived. This play, without the slightest doubt, was actually staged.

Such, in sketchy outline, is La Piana's thesis for the existence of a Byzantine religious theatre. Since they have no direct bearing on this paper, I have omitted mention of his supporting arguments from liturgical practice and iconography. Of primary importance, however, is La Piana's insistence on the crucial position of the "dramatic homilies" in any attempt to marshall and to interpret the scattered evidence. It is therefore unfortunate that comparatively few students of Patristic literature have taken up La Piana's challenge: relatively little research has been centered on the homilies attributed to such authors as Eusebius of Emesa, Eusebius of Alexandria, Epiphanius, Proclus of Constantinople. The *spuria* of John Chrysostom and the corpus of Ephraem Graecus are likewise neglected². Such reluctance is understandable: the absence of critical texts, the tangled manuscript traditions, in short, the cloud of confusion which hovers over these compositions would make any detailed study a frustrating and hazardous adventure.

The alleged relevance of the "dramatic homilies" to any discussion of Greek liturgical theatre is thus established. There is another area of Patristic scholarship in which an investigation of these same homilies would be a major contribution. The very names and works which La Piana cites frequently appear in lists

¹ Text edited by S. Lambros in *Nέος Ἑλληνούμβων* 13, 1916, 381–408; texts and studies by A. Vogt in *Byzantion* 6, 1931, 37–74 and A. C. Mahr, *The Cyprus Passion Cycle*, Notre Dame 1947; Mahr accepts La Piana's thesis, cf. 15–21.

² Cf. La Piana, 'Byz. Theatre' 183 and 210. B. Marx, *Procliana, Untersuchungen über den homiletischen Nachlaß des Patriarchen Proklos von KP*, Münster i. W. 1940, is not entirely satisfactory; reports by Frs. de Aldama, Leroy, and Richard at the Fourth International Conference on Patristic Studies, Oxford 1963, indicate new work in this field.

of the sources for the *kontakia* of Romanos the Melodist (*fl. c* 525–555 A. D.)¹. This fact is especially significant in the context of the following statement by La Piana: ‘Now the drama which developed within the homily assumed also at a certain stage a poetical form very similar to that of the hymn; this seems to suggest the influence of hymnography on the drama in the adoption by the latter of the metrical and rhythmical form that is so conspicuous in Proclus’ *Encomium* (PG 65, 721–757)’².

The implications of this statement are clear: in the alleged evolution scheme³ of drama in the homiletic tradition the influence of Byzantine hymns (especially of the *kontakion*, the most elaborate poetical form) was very great. It may seem at first merely a matter of emphasis, but I should like to suggest that the current of influence moved in the opposite direction: not from hymn to homily, but from homily to hymn. This prevailing direction of influence (from homily to hymn) is generally accepted by students of Byzantine hymnography and would seem to be substantiated by the research of various scholars on the development of the *kontakion* form and on the sources of Romanos the Melodist, the greatest of Christian Greek poets. What effect does this shift in priority of influence have on La Piana’s thesis? At the least, it suggests a re-examination of the evidence for genuine religious theatre developed in the homiletic tradition. The necessity of such a re-examination is underscored by the fact that the *kontakia* of Romanos, a vital link in either chain of argument, are definitely not dramatic in the primary sense of the term. They were verse sermons; they were sung, but not staged; there was in them no physical action or impersonation⁴. In the *kontakia* (as in the source homilies) there were, of course, monologue and dialogue – this dramatic dimension is one of the *kontakion*’s most engaging features. But it is precisely in their dramatic dimension that one can find the most convincing arguments against the hypothesis that when the *kontakia* were composed

¹ Cf. introduction and bibliography in P. Maas and C. A. Trypanis, *Sancti Romani Melodi Cantica: Cantica Genuina*, Oxford 1963.

² La Piana, ‘Byz. Theatre’, 181. An article to be published in B. Z. by F. Leroy, ‘Une homélie Mariale de Proclus de Constantinople’, argues against La Piana’s treatment of this composition. Leroy regards the homily as genuine and integral. ³ La Piana, ‘Byz. Theatre’, 176–177.

⁴ For the sense in which I use these terms cf. H. Craig, *English Religious Drama*, Oxford 1955, 4–5.

true dramatic productions were known. I wish to emphasize that La Piana does not suggest that the *kontakia* were staged¹; yet, in his scheme, they do represent an anomaly which is difficult to explain, especially since many elements in the *kontakia* are so similar to and so greatly influenced by the same homilies which La Piana parades as his primary evidence for a continuous dramatic tradition. Even for the "homilies of the more developed group"² that can be proved post-Romanos compositions one might suggest the *kontakia* (rather than liturgical theatre) as the source for the dramatic elements.

I should like to devote the rest of this paper to a brief exposition of two correlative propositions: an analysis of the works of Romanos the Melodist reveals 1. that they are firmly rooted in the homiletic tradition of the Eastern Church and 2. that they were never designed to be staged³. Neither proposition is spectacularly original or heterodox; but, when juxtaposed, both represent strong arguments against La Piana's thesis.

I. Scholars find that the characteristic elements of the *kontakion*, formal and material, are ultimately derived from Syriac models⁴. Some of the influence is undoubtedly direct: Romanos was born in Syria and was for a time a deacon in the Church of the Resurrection in Beirut⁵. Moreover, there was a considerable Syriac influence on both the shape and the spirit of the sermon-literature of the Greek Church in the 5th, 6th, and later centuries⁶. Any investigation into the literary sources used by the Melodist reveals his debt to such works⁷ – and this debt is quite apparent in those elements which are, so to speak, "dramatic".

¹ M. Carpenter, 'Romanos and the Mystery Play of the East', *The Univ. of Missouri Studies* 11, 1936, 36, also recognizes the non-theatrical nature of the *kontakia*; E. Mioni, *Romano il Melode*, Turin 1937, 27–47, argues that they were genuine liturgical plays.

² La Piana, 'Byz. Theatre', 179.

³ Baud-Bovy (vd. p. 271 note 1), writing on more or less the same topic, uses evidence from one *kontakion*; now that the Maas-Trypanis edition has been published one can present more conclusive proof.

⁴ Maas, 'Das Kontakion', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 19, 1910, 285–305; Maas-Trypanis, *Sancti Romani*, xii–xiii.

⁵ Maas-Trypanis, *Sancti Romani*, xv–xvi.

⁶ Cf. documentation in Maas-Trypanis, *Sancti Romani*, xii–xiii.

⁷ Cf. H. G. Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich*, Munich 1959, 425–428; N. B. Tomadakes, "Ὕμνοι Ρωμανοῦ τοῦ Μελῳδοῦ", I–IV, Athens 1952–1961; R. J. Schork, *The Sources of the Christological Hymns of Romanos the Melodist*, unpublished Oxford D. Phil. thesis 1957.

One can, therefore, trace a clear line of influence from Syriac liturgical poetry to the Greek homiletic corpus and from both to the *kontakia*. An additional point: the intricate metrical patterns of the *kontakia* were in part developed from the rhetorical isocola so prevalent in the rhythmic prose of the century and a half before Romanos¹.

These facts place the homily and the *kontakion* in a rather sharply defined perspective. Into this scheme La Piana would introduce liturgical drama, though admitting that there is no compelling external evidence for religious theatre at this date². I suggest that the "dramatic homilies" served as midwives not to the birth of genuine drama, but to the birth of the *kontakion*.

II. The *kontakia* of Romanos were sung after the reading of the Gospel in the liturgy; they are poetic sermons set to music³. One can, therefore, expect to find their author employing various techniques to fulfill the homiletic demands of this genre. From the literary point of view the most impressive of these techniques is Romanos' skill in presenting his scriptural or hagiographical material in a dramatic context.

In the hymn on the *Wedding at Cana* (7)⁴ Romanos introduces his theme with some general reflections on Mary's perpetual virginity and on the honorable state of matrimony. Then the poet addresses the congregation:

ζ' 1 Ἀγάπα μάθωμεν, δι πρὸς ἡμᾶς ή μήτηρ λέγει τοῦ πάντων θεοῦ⁵.

Let us learn what the Mother of the God of all says to us. The Virgin replies in three stanzas of direct address, in which she justifies her confidence in her Son's ability to perform miracles by citing as a precedent the supreme miracle of His Incarnation. She warns that she will not narrate apocryphal tales, but that she will cling to events recorded in the Bible, written by eyewitnesses to Christ's power – things she personally knows to be true. The remainder of the *kontakion* is a dialogue pivoting around Christ's statement, "My hour has not yet come (John 2,4)."

¹ Maas-Trypanis, *Sancti Romani*, xiv.

² La Piana, 'Byz. Theatre', 178–179.

³ E. Wellesz, A History of Byzantine Music and Hymnography, Oxford 1949, 174 and Maas-Trypanis, *Sancti Romani*, xi; cf. R. J. Schork, 'Typology in the Kontakia of Romanos', *Studia Patristica VI*, Berlin 1962, 211–220.

⁴ The Greek texts are from Maas-Trypanis, *Sancti Romani*; the number in parentheses is that assigned by the editors.

⁵ Maas-Trypanis, *Sancti Romani* 51.

Christ tells His mother (the information is really directed to the congregation) that, far from being dependent upon time and circumstance, He has hesitated for tactical reasons; that is, in the economy of redemption miracles are to be used to confirm faith after neophytes have been properly instructed. Of course, Christ does change the water into wine: to show that parents are to be respected. The plot action concludes with a comparison between this inaugural miracle and the mystery of the Eucharist. In the final stanza the poet and the congregation beg Christ to preserve the wine of orthodox doctrine free from the water of heretical innovation.

This is a more or less typical *kontakion*. In it Romanos successfully exploits both the homiletic and the dramatic dimensions of his genre. He draws from John's Gospel several moral, doctrinal and exegetical lessons, — and this has been accomplished in the dramatic context of direct address and reply by Christ and Mary. Though Romanos explicitly states that he will not quote from apocryphal childhood gospels, he offers no excuse for his extra-scriptural elaborations in dialogue. No excuse is necessary: this freedom is granted to, even demanded from a poet. Psychological insight into the Gospel's characters and purpose, adroit plot construction, and an ability to relate pastoral instruction to his evangelical topic are Romanos' tools.

Sometimes the Melodist rearranges the scriptural order of events for dramatic emphasis. For example, in the *Presentation* (4) Simeon's *Nunc dimittis* speech is given after the recitation of the prophecies. This is done because Simeon is to be sent down into the underworld to announce Christ's birth to Moses and the prophets. The shift of episodes is thus essential to the plot. Here is how the incident is introduced (*ιζ'* 1–3):

*'Ο βασιλεὺς τῶν δυνάμεων προσεδέξατο τοῦ δικαίου τὴν δέησιν
καὶ ἀοράτως ἐφθέγγατο.
«Νῦν σε ἀπολύώ τῶν προσκαίρων, ὡ φίλε μου . . .»¹*

The King of Powers received the prayer of the just man
and invisibly spoke out,

"Now I dismiss you from your duties, my friend . . ."

Note the adverb 'invisibly' (*ἀοράτως*). It is used, I feel, for two reasons: a) Simeon's mission is non-scriptural, even apocryphal;

¹ Maas-Trypanis, Sancti Romani, 33.

b) at the Presentation Christ was an infant and could not have been expected to talk. Thus the Lord's injunction is 'invisible' to avoid giving the impression that the accompanying speech is taken directly from the Bible and to acknowledge that fact that this is the Melodist's way of quickening the dramatic movement of the *kontakion*. Again in the *Pentecost* (33) hymn the apostles offer a 'silent suggestion in their prayers' (*καὶ σιγῶντες ὑπηγόρεον δὲ ηὔχοντο*)¹. Examples of this type could be multiplied.

Another technique employed by Romanos to introduce imaginative elaborations of scriptural passages is the interior monologue. The woman with an issue of blood 'speaks to herself' (*Ἐλεγε καὶ ἔαντήν*)²; she tells Christ that He knows that 'her heart cries out to Him' (*τὴν καρδίαν μου ἤδεις κραυγάσασαν σοι*)³. Doubting Thomas 'speaks within his soul' (*καὶ ἐνδον τῆς φυχῆς ἐλεγε*)⁴ and 'babbles to himself' (*λαλῶν ἔαντῷ*)⁵. All of these formulae introduce direct discourse.

Sometimes Romanos asks, "How is it that you did not say the following?" (*πῶς οὐκ εἶπας*)⁶ and then proceeds to present the hypothetical soliloquy. A variation on this technique is the internal dialogue⁷, in which the same character carries on both sides of an imaginary conversation. For example, when God directs Abraham to sacrifice Isaac, the Patriarch's reply includes the following:

ζ' 1–2 Ἀκούσει τὸν λόγονς σου πάντας ἡγί Σάρρα, ὡ δέσποτα,
καὶ τὴν βουλήν σου ταύτην γνοῦσα μοι λέξει.⁸

O Lord, Sarah will hear all your words
and when she knows your decree she will say to me . . .

Sarah's potential reactions are then reported in direct discourse for five stanzas, after which Abraham comments on her words – all within his speech to God.

¹ Maas-Trypanis, *Sancti Romani*, 261, ε'3.

² Maas-Trypanis, *Sancti Romani*, 89, ε'1.

³ Maas-Trypanis, *Sancti Romani*, 92, ιη'5.

⁴ Maas-Trypanis, *Sancti Romani*, 237, ζ'6.

⁵ Maas-Trypanis, *Sancti Romani*, 238, ι'1.

⁶ Maas-Trypanis, *Sancti Romani*, 323, γ'4; here the poet speaks to Abraham in apostrophe.

⁷ Cf. N. B. Tomadakes, 'Ο ἐσωτερικὸς διάλογος τῶν ὑμῶν P. τοῦ M.,' *Εἰσαγόγη εἰς τὴν Βυζαντινὴν Φιλολογίαν*, I 2, Athens 1958, 269–290 and 'Ρωμανὸς καὶ θέατρον,' ibid. 265–269. Tomadakes likewise denies the existence of a Byzantine religious theatre.

⁸ Maas-Trypanis, *Sancti Romani* 324.

Another technique is the parenthetical ‘it is probable’ (*εἰκότως*)¹ or ‘I imagine’ (*ώς οἶμαι*)². These expressions are frequently used as preludes to speech not found in Romanos’ Biblical sources. A corresponding device is illustrated by this passage from the *Theophany* (5):

γ' 6–7 τοιαῦτα δ σωτῆρος οὐ λόγοις ἀλλ' ἔργοις πρὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον εἰπών . . .³

Such things the Saviour spoke to the man
not in words, but in deeds . . .

Mary Magdalene cries out to the risen Christ ‘not with words, but with tears’⁴. In another *Resurrection* (25) *kontakion* Romanos cross-examines some hostile witnesses, the tomb guards. The poet concludes his case by stating:

ιδ' 2 ἀπεκρίθησαν οὐ φωνῇ μοι διμιλήσαντες, φυγῇ δὲ δηλώσαντες⁵.

They replied by confessing to me, but not with their voices; rather they made everything clear by their flight.

On the stage actions speak louder than, or just as loud as, words. When a poet acknowledges this fact, yet immediately follows his acknowledgement with detailed direct speech, I would conclude that he was operating in a tradition that was only analogously dramatic – and certainly not theatrical. This internal evidence (and there is much more) indicates that the *kontakia* were never intended to be staged. Thanks to the genius of Romanos, such hymns are the glory of Byzantine church poetry; moreover, they are a tribute to the vitality and adaptability of the homiletic tradition of the East.

¹ Maas-Trypanis, *Sancti Romani*, 69 *ιε'4*; 433 *η'2*; 435 *ιγ'2*.

² Maas-Trypanis, *Sancti Romani*, 225 *γ'2*; 231 *ιθ'4*. Maas comments on these two techniques in ‘Das Kontakion’, B. Z. 19, 1910, 291 note 2; cf. Marx, Procliana, 27 and 39.

³ Maas-Trypanis, *Sancti Romani*, 35.

⁴ Maas-Trypanis, *Sancti Romani*, 226: *ζ'4*: ὅτερος ἐβόα, οὐ δήμασιν ἀλλὰ δάκρυσιν.

⁵ Maas-Trypanis, *Sancti Romani*, 192; also 192 *ιβ'5–6*: οὐ δήμασι πείσας με, / ἀλλὰ πεάγμασι δεῖξας μοι. The same technique is used in an early *kontakion* edited by Maas, Frühbyzantinische Kirchenpoesie (Kleine Texte 52/53), Bonn 1910, 14:

καὶ τοῖς λυγίσμασι θρῆνον τὰ δένδρα
ἐπολον ἡχούντα ‘πον εἰ ὁ Ἀδάμ’;

Cf. Marx, Procliana, 27 and 40 for this device in homilies.

One corollary: Wellesz has pointed out that the *kanon* replaced *kontakion* as the standard form of liturgical poetry because the 19th Canon of the Council in Trullo dictated the reinstatement of the prose sermon for purposes of comment on the Gospel text¹. Presumably, after the death of Romanos, the *kontakion* became too florid or too vapid, poetically and musically, to discharge its homiletic function. Now, if there existed a Byzantine liturgical theatre in the homiletic tradition (as La Piana supposes), could it have escaped a similar condemnation?

In conclusion, I believe that there is definite evidence for rejecting the La Piana thesis that there was a pre-Iconoclastic theatre in the Greek Church. The "dramatic homily" never produced true theatre; nor were the *kontakia*, firmly grounded in the Syriac-influenced homiletic tradition, ever theatrically produced. Internal evidence of the dramatic dimension in the hymns of Romanos proves this to be the case. Moreover, any dramatic fragments in homilies that can positively be dated post-Romanos can be explained as *transformationes (Umarbeitungen)*² of *kontakia*. One need not posit the existence of a theatrical tradition, especially when there is, in fact, no external evidence for it. The question of a later Byzantine religious drama, independent of Western influence, is another matter³.

¹ Cf. Wellesz, *Byz. Music and Hymnography*, 174 and 73; Canon 75 (*Mansi IX*, 975) also seems to the point. This evidence is especially forceful in view of La Piana's statement, "... in its most highly developed form, it [drama] took the place of the sermon, though always accompanied by homiletic introduction and comments." ('Byz. Theatre', 185). In short, what La Piana sees as liturgical drama, other scholars see as the *kontakia*.

² Cf. Maas-Trypanis, *Sancti Romani*, 73: pseudo-Chrysostom, In Meretricem et Pharisaeum (PG 59, 531–536) as a *transformatio* of Romanos' *kontakion* (10). Mahr shared this view, *Cyprus Passion Cycle* 37 and 51; also vd. Mahr, *Relations of Passion Plays to St. Ephrem the Syrian*, Columbus, Ohio 1942, 6. I believe that the homily is pre-Romanos: Schork, *Sources* 183–189.

³ Cf. Baud-Bovy (vd. p. 271, note 1) 333 and Mahr, *Cycle*, 14–21. New evidence for the possibility of a liturgical play in the eleventh century is given by M. M. Velimirović, 'Liturgical Drama in Byzantium and Russia', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 16, 1962, 351–385.

The Heavenly Sacrifice in the Greek Fathers

H. E. SYMONDS C. R., Mirfield

The Epistle to the Hebrews, in interpreting the saving work of Our Lord, makes abundant use of the ceremonies of the Day of Atonement. The author speaks of the entry of the High Priest into the second tabernacle (i. e. the Holy of Holies) not apart from blood (*οὐ χωρὶς αἷματος*) which he offers for himself and the 'ignorances of the people' (9,7). With this he parallels the work of Christ Who having become high priest of good things to come (or 'having come') through the greater and more perfect tabernacle — not of this creation, nor through (*διὰ*) the blood of goats and calves, but through His own blood entered once and for all (*ἐφάνταξεν*) into the sanctuary (*τὰ δυῖα*), finding (*εὑράμενος*, probably not 'having found') eternal redemption (9,12).

The author is thinking of the Jewish high priest who has slain the victim outside and enters through the veil and sprinkles the mercy seat with its blood. This last action is of the essence of the sacrifice (Leviticus 17,11 : 'the life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls'). Parallel with this action of the Jewish priest is that of Christ Who entered not into a sanctuary made with hands, but into heaven itself to appear before the face of God for us (*έμφανισθῆναι*) (9,24). If the action of Christ in heaven is parallel to that of the Jewish High Priest on the day of Atonement, it would seem that He is offering sacrifice in heaven. This inference is strengthened by the teaching of the Epistle that Our Lord is a High Priest after the order of Melchisedek (9,20), and as a high priest He must have something to offer (*ἀναγκαῖον ἔχειν τι καὶ τοῦτον οὐ προσενέγκη*) (8,3) not on earth but in the heavenly sanctuary (8,2).

It is true that the author insists on the once for all character of Christ's offering e. g. 10,10 by which will we have been sanctified by the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all (*διὰ*

τῆς προσφορᾶς τοῦ σώματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐφάπαξ). And this offering is regarded as having taken place before He sat down at the right hand of God (1,3). In these passages there is perhaps a return to the Pauline (and indeed common Christian) view that the Passion and Death of Christ was the real atoning Sacrifice, and that it was final and all sufficient, in the sense that no second sacrifice was ever needed. Christ would never die again and after the Resurrection and Ascension He reigns for ever in Heaven. But this does not preclude the fact that He may continually present His Sacrifice of Himself as sacrificed before the Eternal Father.

So far De la Taille would agree – *manet Christus Deo in perpetuum sacer seu theothytus*¹.

Lepin goes further, however, and insists that Our Lord in His Heavenly state is actually offering Himself to God². How far, if at all, does the witness of the Greek Fathers confirm Lepin's view?

Setting aside Irenaeus, who merely maintains that there is an altar in heaven, to which our prayers and oblations are directed (adv. Haer. IV 6), we turn to Origen who says: 'For all of these therefore Christ now stands before the face of God interceding (*interpellans*) for us. He stands by the altar, in order that He may offer propitiation for us to God' (In Lev. Hom. VII 2).

More definitely he says: 'Having fulfilled His dispensation He penetrates the heavens and enters in to His Father to make Him propitious to the human race and to pray and have His prayer answered (*exoret*) for all those who believe in Him. This propitiation made by Him, by which He repropitiates the Father to men, John the Apostle knows, and says "we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ, the righteous, and He is the propitiation"' (ibid. IX 5)³.

Of the martyrs beneath the altar in heaven, Origen writes: 'Placed there they assist at the divine sacrifices . . . they reach

¹ Mysterium fidei 179f.

² L'Idée du Sacrifice de la Messe 707.

³ *pro his ergo omnibus adsistit (Christus) nunc vultui Dei interpellans, pro nobis adsistit altari, ut repropitiationem pro nobis offerat Deo.* In Lev. Hom. VII 2: *impleta dispensatione penetrat coelos et intrat ad patrem ut eum propitium humano generi faciat, et exoret pro omnibus credentibus in se.* Hanc repropitiationem eius, qua hominibus repropitiat patrem sciens Johannes Apostolus dicit (and he quotes 1 John 2, 1–2).

the very altar of God where is Jesus Christ Himself, the high priest (*pontifex*) of good things to come (in Jud. VII 2)¹. This is a clear assertion of a heavenly sacrifice, but Origen does not say what is offered in it.

Athanasius is clear about the sacrifice of Christ being a permanent thing. He offers a ‘reliable (*πιστήν*) sacrifice which remains and does not pass away’ (Or. 2 c. Arianos 7; PG 26, 165). But this refers to the sacrifice made on the Cross.

To Epiphanius the priesthood of Christ is unchanging, and as priest He now offers gifts, and He Himself is the Victim offered. ‘He offers His priesthood to the Father, taking the material (*φύραμα*) of it from humanity, in order that He may be established as priest for us after the order of Melchisedek, which has no succession. For He remains offering the everlasting gifts for us, first having offered Himself’ (Adv. Haer. 55,4; PG 41, 980)².

But this offering seems to refer to the Cross, and though one may infer that as the everlasting priest Our Lord offers Himself in Heaven, Epiphanius does not definitely state this.

Chrysostom, while insisting that Our Lord is a priest, denies that He sacrifices (*ἱεράσθαι*) now, and that He is now a *λειτουργός*. Chrysostom seems at this point to confine the function of Christ as heavenly priest to intercession. His words are: ‘when he (Paul) showed Him (Christ) as a priest, he then opportunely says making intercession.’ (δέ τε ἔδειξεν αὐτὸν ἱερέα, τότε εὐκαίρως λέγει τὸ ἐγτυγχάνειν, in Hebr. VII, Homil. XIII 3; PG 63, 105). But he means by this that the heavenly Christ does not offer a new sacrifice. On the other hand he insists that there is no priest without a sacrifice, and therefore the Christ above is a priest on every count, from Melchisedek, from the oath (sworn by God to Melchisedek), from the fact of offering sacrifice. Chrysostom’s words are: ‘There is no priest without a sacrifice, therefore this man must have a sacrifice. Otherwise (ἄλλως, on other grounds?) by saying that He is above (ἄνω) he says and shows that He is a priest on every ground, from Melchisedek, from the fact of

¹ *ibi enim positae divinis adiuntur sacrificiis – ad ipsum Deo altare pervenient ubi est ipse Dominus Jesus Christus pontifex futurorum bonorum.*

² τὴν δὲ ἱερωσύνην τῷ Πατρὶ προσφέρει, ἐξ ἀνθεωτητος τὸ φύραμα λαβάν, ἵνα ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἱερεὺς καταστῇ κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ, τὴν μὴ ἔχουσαν διαδοχήν. Μένει γάρ ταῦτα ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν εἰς τὸ διηνεκές δῶρα προσφέρων· πρῶτον μὲν ἐκατὸν προσενέγκας, . . . αὐτὸς ἱερεῖσθαι, αὐτὸς θῦμα, αὐτὸς ἱερεὺς . . . τῆς ἱερωσύνης αὐτοῦ τὸ ἀμετάστατον ἐδραλώμα εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας ἀπεγάσσηται.

the oath, from offering sacrifice.' (In Hebr. VIII, Homil. XIV, PG 63, 111)¹.

Chrysostom also denies that there is any contradiction between Our Lord as sitting and as being High Priest, as he ascribes the former to the Divine Nature, and the latter to the Human (ibid., a few lines above). Elsewhere he makes it clear that Christ is both victim and priest in the heavenly region. It is above (*ἄνω*) that we have a victim, above, the priest, above, the sacrifice (In Hebr. VI, Hom. XI, PG 63, 92)².

This is still more definitely stated in his comment on *ἔμφατισθῆναι . . . τῷ προσώπῳ τοῦ θεοῦ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν* where he says (Christ) went up with a sacrifice which is able to propitiate the Father (Hom. XVII, p. 128)³.

Cyril of Alexandria regards the heavenly Christ as a *λειτουργός*, pointing out that it is in His Human nature that He acts as a priest. 'Surely it is not contrary to established usage to say that Christ is a priest (*ἱερουργός*) who is in the throne of the Godhead as God, and ministering (*λειτουργῶν*) in human fashion' (De Recta Fide ad Reginas 44, PG 76, 1307)⁴ and earlier in the same treatise, 'Christ sits on the right hand of God and has the throne of majesty in the heavens, and is a minister (*λειτουργός*) of the sanctuary and the true tabernacle above, offering (*προσκομίζων*) to Himself and to the Father the acts of worship (*λατρείας*) which proceed from all' (ibid. 1312)⁵.

But it is noticeable that S. Cyril does not speak of Our Lord as offering the sacrifice of Himself. It is our acts of worship that He presents to God.

Lastly we may mention three of the mediaeval Greek Fathers.

Oecumenius, commenting on Hebr. VIII 2: 'It is necessary that this man also should have something to offer', says 'this is

¹ ἵερεν δὲ χωρὶς θυσίας οὐκ ἔστι· δεῖ τοίνυν καὶ τοῦτον ἔχειν θυσίαν. ὅλως δέ, εἰπάντες διὰ διω ἔστι, λέγει καὶ δεκανοῖς, διὰ ἱερεὺς ἔστι πάντοθεν, ἀπὸ τοῦ Μελ-χισεδέχ, ἀπὸ τοῦ δρκού, ἀπὸ τοῦ προσενεγκείν θυσίαν.

² Διω ἔχομεν τὸ ἱερεῖον, διω τὸν ἱερέα, διω τὴν θυσίαν.

³ τι ἔστι ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν; μετὰ θυσίας ἀνῆλθε, φησί, δυναμένης ἐξιλεώσασθαι τὸν πατέρα.

⁴ πῶς οὐκ ἀσυνήθης ἱερουργός δ Χριστός ὁ καὶ ἐν τοῖς τῆς θεότητος θάνατοις ὡς θεός, καὶ λειτουργῶν ἀνθρωπίνως;

⁵ Χριστός, ἐν δεξιᾷ κάθηται τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ τὸν θρόνον ἔχει τῆς μεγαλωσίης ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, καὶ τῶν ἀγίων ἔστι λειτουργός, καὶ τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς διω καὶ ἀληθεῖᾶς ἔστι τε καὶ τῷ πατρὶ προσκομίζων τὰς παρὰ πάντων λατρείας.

because He had His own flesh, which also He offered¹. But he probably identified this offering with Christ's death, as he goes on to say 'if He is a high priest for ever, why did He die? Why? in order that He might offer Himself as sacrifice' (PG 119, 361)².

He adds, He must act as priest (*ἱερᾶσθαι*) there (in heaven) but acting as priest means interceding (*ἐγνωγχάνειν*) for us (*ibid.*)³

Secondly, Symeon of Thessalonica (1410–1429 AD):

'Christ is the eternal priest after the order of Melchisedek (that is, in bread and wine) never ceasing, or rather eternal, priest, because He has sacrificed (*τέθυκε*) Himself voluntarily through the Cross, and (still) sacrifices; and offered Himself to the Father and (still) offers. And He lies a continual victim (*σφάγιον*) and an eternal propitiation (*ἱλαστήριον*) for us. Him we have a great high priest who has passed through the heaven, Jesus the Son of God' (*De Sacramentis* c. 44, PG 155, 189)⁴.

It is true that Symeon is dealing with the sacrament of the Eucharist, but the last sentence makes it clear that it is the heavenly Christ he is speaking of, who is the victim and the propitiation on the altars of the Church because He is the same in heaven.

Finally Theophylact (Abp. of Bulgaria, d. 1107), who is quite explicit about the heavenly sacrifice:

'Christ offered a sacrifice on the Cross, but He entered into heaven with a sacrifice which is able to appease the Father (*μετὰ θυσίας . . . διναμένης ἐξιλεώσασθαι τὸν πατέρα*).' (on Hebrews IX 24).

Commenting on Hebr. XIII 12 he speaks of Christ as High Priest bringing His Blood into the Sanctuary to the Father, while His Body was crucified outside the camp: '*τὸ μὲν αἷμα αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰ ἄγια εἰσεκόμισε τῷ πατρὶ ὡς ἀρχιερεύς, τὸ δὲ σῶμα ἀνεσκολοπίσθη ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς.* So our high priests, accomplishing a memorial of that sacrifice, bring the blood of the Lord into our sanctuary of the altar as to heaven' (PG 125, 393f.).

¹ διὸ ἔσχε τὴν σάρκα τὴν ἴδιαν, ἣν καὶ προσήνεγκε.

² εἰ ἀρχιερεύς ἐστιν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, διὰ τί ἀπέθανε; διὰ τί; Ινα προσενέγκη θυσίαν ἑαυτόν.

³ *ἱερᾶσθαι* δὲ νόει, τὸ ἐντυγχάνειν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν.

⁴ δτι καὶ αὐτὸς λερεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα κατά τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ (ἐν ἀρτῳ δηλονότι καὶ οἴῳ) μηδαμῶς πανόμενος. Καὶ αἰώνιος μᾶλλον λερεὺς δτι καὶ τέθυκεν ἑαυτὸν ἐκονσίως διὰ σταυροῦ καὶ θνεῖ καὶ προσήνεγκε τῷ πατρὶ καὶ προσάγει. Καὶ σφάγιον κεῖται διηγεῖται καὶ αἰώνιον ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἵλαστήριον. δν καὶ μέγαν ἔχομεν ἀρχιερέα ἡμεῖς διεληλυθότα τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, 'Ιησοῦν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ.

To sum up. Irenaeus speaks vaguely of an altar in heaven to which our prayers are directed. Origen more definitely says that Christ in heaven makes His Father propitious to us. Chrysostom suggests there is a sacrifice in heaven but only in the sense that Christ, the victim of Calvary, is permanently in heaven, and that therefore the power of the sacrifice offered on Calvary is permanent. Symeon of Thessalonica speaks of Christ still offering Himself, but it may be that he was thinking only of the Eucharistic offering on earth. Theophylact makes the parallel of Christ's heavenly work with that of the Jewish High Priest more emphatic by saying that He brings His own Blood into the Sanctuary. But he seems to mean nothing more than that the Heavenly Christ presents to the Father the propitiatory sacrifice already made on the Cross.

It would seem, then, that although a right interpretation of the Epistle to the Hebrews demands the view that Our Lord in Heaven is offering Himself, that is to say His Sacrificed Body, to the Father, the Greek Fathers with one or two exceptions do not state this plainly. They therefore only tend to justify the position of De la Taille, that the Heavenly Christ presents the sacrifice once offered on the Cross, rather than that of Lepin who believes in an active sacrifice in heaven.

Adsumus, Domine, Adsumus

From Toledo IV to Vatican II

T. F. TAYLOR, Sherborne

The Toledan Council of 633 was most active in regulating affairs for the very recently christianised state. It met under the active presidency of Isidore of Seville, although the metropolitan, Justus of Toledo, was present; and Isidore's particular contributions are prominent. The Council imposed one liturgical order for the Visigothic kingdom and Narbonne¹. Canon 4 deals with the holding of councils. When the priests have sat some time in silence, let the archdeacon say, Let us pray, and straightway let all prostrate themselves. Then let one of the senior bishops, rising up, say a collect. After the collect and the responsive Amen, again let the deacon say, Rise up; and forthwith let all get up and bishops and presbyters take their seats. The formula *Adsumus* is not specifically quoted, but it has been traditionally associated with this Council and its authorship ascribed to Isidore.

The current official Roman Catholic text is as follows:

Adsumus, Domine Sancte Spiritus, adsumus, peccati quidem immanitate detenti, sed in Nomine Tuo specialiter congregati. Veni ad nos, et esto nobiscum: dignare illabi cordibus nostris. Doce nos quid agamus, quo gradiamur et ostende quid efficere debeamus, ut, Te auxiliante, Tibi in omnibus placere valeamus. Esto solus suggestor et effector iudiciorum nostrorum, qui solus cum Deo Patre et eius Filio nomen possides gloriosum. Non nos patiaris perturbatores esse iustitiae qui summam diligis aequitatem. Non in sinistrum nos ignorantia trahat, non favor inflectat, non acceptio munieris vel personae corrumpat. Sed iunge nos Tibi efficaciter solius Tuae gratiae dono. Ut simus in Te unum, et in nullo deviamus a vero. Sicut in Nomine Tuo collecti, sic in cunctis teneamus cum moderamine pietatis iustitiam, ut et hic a Te in nullo dissentiat

¹ Can. 2, Labbe, *Concilia V*, col. 1704.

sententia nostra, et in futuro pro bene gestis consequamur praemia sempiterna.

It is a moving and melodious petition, yet businesslike. It speaks both timelessly and to the occasion¹. Quite out of line with the ancient liturgical practice of Rome, it addresses the Holy Spirit, as do many Visigothic prayers especially in the time near Pentecost². The fine opening contrast of *detenti* and *aggregati* (held down by the enormity of sin, yet selected and brought into the flock) balances the simple but effective repetition of *Adeumus*. This is a typical Visigothic *exordium*, as e. g. *Adesto, adesto* at the beginning of the printed Mass Canon³, although there is no manuscript witness of this ringing summons. Again, *dignare illabi cordibus nostris* is familiar in Visigothic invocations of the Spirit⁴. The trilogies also are Visigothic in manner – either simple,

*doce nos quid agamus,
quo gradiamur ostende,
quid efficiamur, operare;*

or complicated with clauses of assonance – *non trahat, non inflectat, non corrumpat*; and the final assonances are confidently Visigothic – *gratiae dono, deviamus a vero, sententia nostra, praemia sempiterna*. As Louis Brou said, it is impossible to have a Visigothic prayer without these⁵.

But is it by Isidore, as L. Brou thought very probable and Y. Congar has stated?

Source criticism of Spanish prayers is notoriously difficult. Liturgical authors frequently decorated their compositions with flowery excerpts from ready writers. Cf. the centonisation of the *inlatio* on Maundy Thursday, inspired by Augustine, *Tractatus IV in Joannem*, and the Mass *pro seipso sacerdote*⁶. True, the prayer, like Isidore at times, has short crisp clauses (*non favor inflectat*,

¹ Ch. Morgan, *Reflections in a Mirror*, 2nd ser., 1946, 53.

² M. Férotin, *Liber Mozarabicus Sacramentorum*, Paris 1912, prayers Nos. 767, 776, 781, 790, 791; J. Vives, *Oracional Visigótico*, 1946, Nos. 1026, 1033, 1043.

³ PL 85, 550.

⁴ M. Férotin, *Liber Mozarabicus Sacramentorum*, Paris 1912, No. 767 *Veni ad nos... nostrisque inlabere cordibus*; No. 781 Sp. *Sete... his propitiis inlabere holocaustis*; No. 791 Paracelite Sp. . . . *nostris hodie inlabere sensibus*. Cf. 787 *Et ideo in lapis Spiritus Sancti*.

⁵ L. Brou, ap. *Isidoriana*, Léon 1961, 206–209.

⁶ A. A. King, *Liturgies of the Primatial Sees*, 1957, 567.

*non acceptio muneric vel personae corrumpat) and his *De Officiis* II. 2 seems like it where we read how the clergy ought to behave, — *dolos et coniurationes caveant, odium aemulationem obtrvectionem atque inadvertiam fugiant*¹. But this is not sufficient to hang the prayer on him. J. Fontaine's article, *Théorie et Pratique du Style chez Isidore de Seville*² describes the manner as *lâche, tendu, stéréotype*, with parallels of synonyms and similar endings; but it is too indefinite for our purpose. P. Sejourné³ argued that the primitive text of our conciliar *ordo* was anterior to 633 because the lost Codex Rachio and a Paris manuscript (used by Hardouin and Mansi) read *E concilio III aera duodevicesima*. But this is an impossible deduction from the loose and inaccurate chronology; nor does it strengthen the case for Isidore's authorship. He might have composed the prayer for his provincial Council at Seville in 619 and used it at Toledo IV, but we have no precise information as to what prayer was recommended for use by Toledo IV⁴.*

But through the influential canonical *collectio Hispana*, probably contemporary with Toledo IV⁵, the Spanish *ordo ad synodum* permanently affected European procedure. There is no certain proof that Isidore compiled the Hispana, but much is due to his important rôle in establishing discipline⁶. J. B. Pitra⁷ found the oldest Spanish (vulgate) text of the *ordo* in the lost Codex Rachio (to be dated 787) where the preliminary rubric exactly transcribed under Nos. 3 and 5 the fourth canon of Toledo. Yet in the 150 years from Toledo IV some interpolations have come in, the prayer formularies having been edited in Spain for churches following the rite of Toledo. All the synodal prayers and allocutions of the *ordo*, both in the Mozarabic texts and in the Gallican recensions, all swelling and redundant in style, show Spanish influence, and the early native witnesses retain a single

¹ PL 83, 778.

² Vigiliae Christianae 14, 1960, 65ff.

³ Le Dernier Père de l'Eglise, S. Isidore, 1929, 135.

⁴ C. J. Hefele-H. Leclercq, Histoire des conciles 3, p. 256.

⁵ G. Le Bras, Institutions ecclésiastiques de la chrétienté médiévale, 1, 1959, 47 and literature noted.

⁶ L. Bréhier-R. Aigrain, ap. V. Flûche-A. F. Martin, Histoire de l'Eglise V 244f.

⁷ Analecta novissima I, 1885, 87–97; cf. B. Franck, Recherches sur le ms. de l'Hispana de l'évêque Rachio, ap. Archives de l'Eglise d'Alsace 18, 1956, 67–82.

metropolitan, while later non-Spanish manuscripts have three or five metropolitans.

The terms of the prayer are simple and unaffected (*non in sinistrum nos ignorantia trahat, non favor inflectat, non acceptio munieris vel personae corrumpat*). They are Spanish symptoms which Edmund Bishop showed to be congenial to Celtic Christians. But P. Sejourné strangely judged that the frequent rhythm proved them to be later than Toledo IV¹. However, this feature is as apparent in the earliest years of the 7th century as in any of the later years. Its recurring rhymes may tire us, but they were popular and so were wisely used in teaching the clergy. They were strongly influenced by Gregory I and occur in the preface to the Hispana. It seems impossible to argue solely from their brief lively tone, eloquent and artistically duplicated, for a date later than 633.

Since the Toledan Council fathers, then, gave a liturgical apparatus for councils, this powerfully affected a Roman form, revised in Gaul for provincial synods as *Qualiter concilium agatur generale*. (Designation as provincial or general has at times wildly varied.) Codex Rachio after the prologue (and a very early mention of the Christian era) has *Ordo de celebrando concilio*. It reads *congregati* instead of *aggregati*; it omits the verbose *ut, Te auxiliante, Tibi in omnibus placere valeamus*; and ends (like some other versions) *in qua oratione Pater noster non dicat[ur] nec benedictio*. And in Gallican form it passed into the pseudo-Isidorian Decretals².

Not all pontificals quickly admitted this *ordo* from Spain. Some of the fullest inserted it after the Roman *ordo*, and others have only the Spanish *ordo*, including the canons of Toledo. An early Rouen pontifical shows a middle stage, inserting *Adsumus* in the middle of the Roman formulae; then after a canon of Nicaea it reproduces the plain Hispana text. The legislation from Spain was becoming common form in synodical discipline.

Adsumus appears in the Benedictio of Archbishop Robert, of the latter part of the 10th century, under the title *Orationes in Synodo*, with a very difficult and/or corrupt aspiration for the close of the synod³. It occurs about the same time in the Ponti-

¹ op. cit. 149, App VI.

² F. Maassen, Geschichte der Quellen und der Literatur des canonischen Rechts im Abendlande I, 1870, 404, n. 5.

³ Ed. H. A. Wilson, HBS 24, 1903, 152.

fical of Langres, or perhaps Halinard, Archbishop of Lyons¹. It comes too in the so-called Pontifical of Egbert (which seems to stem about 973 from a West Frankish source). Its version is little different except that it weakens *Esto salus* to *Esto solus*².

Indeed the Spanish *ordo De concilio celebrando* was recopied into most collections depending on the Hispana³, into some pontifical manuscripts and similar documents, e. g. the Constitutions of William of Hirsau, as the prayer before the election of an abbot⁴. Thus its general acceptance into these influential circles both made its entry into Roman formularies more powerful and attested the prayer's intrinsic usefulness.

The *Ordo Romanus Antiquus* (or *vulgatus*) had an order for councils, but beginning with the insertion of the Gallican *Examinatio in ordinatione episcopi*, manuscripts of the 9th and 10th centuries of German provenance had great influence (under the Ottos) in Italy, so that the 13th century *Ordo* or *Ordinarium papale* (Mabillon's *Ordo X*) includes the *Ordo Romanus qualiter concilium generale agatur*. The old name was kept, but covering quite un-Roman stock. Durandus' fashionable Pontifical c. 1292 in the third part included an *Ordo ad consilium seu synodum celebrandum* – a feature which was finally adopted during the 15th century.

Its origin clearly puzzled 18th century commentators like Catalani⁵ and J. B. Gattico⁶. But this prayer which is used now at Vatican II by the Pope before each public session and by the presiding cardinal at each general congregation has been well tried – at the election of a prelate⁷, for priests before hearing confessions, at the admission of catechumens⁸, before choosing an abbot, at consistories under the Pope's presidency. If we cannot certainly attribute it to S. Isidore – and it does not ring close to the authentically Isidorian *Benedictio lucerna ante altare* of the Léon Sacramentary – it is of his age and spirituality. *In sinistrum nos non trahat ignorantia.*

¹ V. Leroquais, *Les Pontificaux* Ms. des Bibliothèques de France I 145.

² Surtees Soc. 27, 1853, 98.

³ M. Andrieu, *Le Pontifical romain au Moyen-Age IV*, Table des Initia.

⁴ PL 150, 1038.

⁵ *Pontificale Rom. . . . commentariis illust.*, 1740, III 97.

⁶ *Acta selecta caeremonialia* 1753, 125f.

⁷ E. Martène, *De Ant. Eccl. Ritibus*, Lib. III cap. I, t. 2, 309f.

⁸ Durandus, MS Carpentras 93; Andrieu III 95.

Der patristische Geist und der griechisch-orthodoxe Gottesdienst

E. THEODOROU, Saloniki

In diesem kurzen Referat werden wir phänomenologisch die Punkte untersuchen, in denen die Beziehungen der Kirchenväter zum griechisch-orthodoxen Gottesdienst sichtbar werden. Die wichtigsten dieser Punkte sind die folgenden:

I. Das Leben und die Lehre der Kirchenväter ist vom liturgischen Geist durchdrungen. Der Mittelpunkt des Lebens der frühen Christen und der Kirchenväter war der Gottesdienst. „Dieser, – wie J. Daniélou betont hat –, galt nicht nur als eine Sammlung von Riten, die dazu bestimmt waren, das profane Leben zu heiligen. Die Sakramente erscheinen als die zentralen Ereignisse christlicher Existenz und des Lebens überhaupt, in denen sich das Heilswirken des Gottes des Alten und des Neuen Testaments fortsetzt. Durch sie wird der Mensch neu geschaffen und hat bereits Anteil am Reiche Gottes“¹. Die großen Kirchenväter lebten für diesen Gottesdienst und aus demselben heraus. Wenn man ihre Predigten liest, entsteht der Eindruck, daß es sich um liturgische Gebetstexte handelt.

II. Die Kirchenväter aber empfingen nicht nur Einflüsse von dem Gottesdienst, sondern sie beeinflußten auch diesen Gottesdienst in starkem Maße. Das Leben, das persönliche Beispiel, die Katechesen, die Predigten und die Schriften der Kirchenväter trugen sehr zur Entwicklung des griechisch-orthodoxen Gottesdienstes bei:

a) Wichtig war die Wirksamkeit der Väter für die Regelung und Neuordnung der eucharistischen Liturgie, die im Lauf der Zeit tiefgreifende Umformungen erfahren hat. Daß die bekanntesten Liturgien der sogenannten „liturgischen Familien“ oder „Typen“ auf berühmte Kirchenväter zurückgeführt oder ihnen

¹ J. Daniélou, Liturgie und Bibel (deutsch von Lioba Kuntz OSB), München 1963, 25–26.

zugeschrieben werden, beweist, daß das katholische Bewußtsein der Kirche die Rolle der großen Väter für die Umformung der eucharistischen Liturgie anerkannte. Wir erwähnen zum Beispiel die sogenannte Chrysostomsliturgie, die noch heute in der griechisch-orthodoxen Kirche an den meisten Tagen des Jahres gebraucht wird, sowie die Basiliusliturgie, die noch heute in dieser Kirche an zehn Tagen des Jahres in Gebrauch ist. Außer der griechischen Sprache sind sie noch in verschiedenen orientalischen Sprachen überliefert¹. Es ist auch bekannt, daß Proklus von Konstantinopel das sogenannte „große Trishagion“ in die Liturgie eingeführt hat². Auch ist bekannt, daß in der römisch-katholischen Kirche etwas Ähnliches geschah. Papst Gregor I. der Große (590–604) „hat die Meßfeier reformiert, u. a. den Kanon in seine jetzige Gestalt gebracht und überhaupt das Meßbuch neu redigiert“³.

b) Der Inhalt der liturgischen Gebete hat große Beziehung zum patristischen Geist und zur Lehre der Kirchenväter. Das liturgische Wort ist hierbei als Ausdruck des Glaubens, der Frömmigkeit und der lebendigen liturgischen Erlebnisse zu würdigen⁴. Die liturgischen Predigten Gregors von Nyssa beeinflußten z. B. viele orientalische Liturgien. Die äthiopische und koptische Liturgie führen als Vorbild der Taufe das Opfer des Elias an⁵, das sich auch in Gregor von Nyssas Predigt über die Taufe findet, die er zu Epiphanie hielt⁶. Gregor von Nyssa kommentiert das Opfer des Elias folgendermaßen: „Elias sagte durch jenes wunderbare Opfer das Sakrament der Taufe, das später kommen sollte, deutlich voraus. Feuer fiel auf dreimal ausgegossenes Wasser herab, damit deutlich werde, daß dort, wo geheiliges Wasser ist, auch der Geist ist, der belebende, glühende, feurige Geist, der die Gottlosen verzehrt und die Gläubigen erleuchtet“⁷. Das Thema scheint auf Origenes zurückzugehen. Das Opfer des Elias als Vorbild der Taufe ist anzutreffen im Kommentar des Origenes zum Johannesevangelium⁸.

¹ B. Altaner, Patrologie, 5. Aufl., Freiburg 1958, 293 und 262–263.

² Ebd. 303.

³ Ebd. 433.

⁴ Vgl. J. Lechner – L. Eisenhofer, Liturgik des römischen Ritus, Freiburg 1953, 15.

⁵ J. Daniélou, ebd. 110.

⁶ Gregor von Nyssa, *Εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τῶν φάτων ἐν ἡ ἐβαπτίσθη ὁ Κύριος*, Migne PG 46, 592.

⁷ Migne PG 46, 592.

⁸ J. Daniélou, ebd.

c) Die Kirchenväter trugen sehr zur Gestaltung des liturgischen Kirchenjahres bei. Viele der jährlich wiederkehrenden Feste sind der Erinnerung an die großen Kirchenväter (z. B. die Heiligen Athanasius, Basilus, Gregor, Johannes Chrysostomus, Johannes von Damaskus, Gregor Palamas) gewidmet. Viele Predigten der großen Kirchenväter beeinflußten außerdem das allgemeine Bewußtsein des Volkes und schufen die notwendigen Voraussetzungen für die Anerkennung, Festlegung und Verbreitung vieler Feiertage, welche zur Ehre von Märtyrern und Heiligen der ersten Christenzeit geschaffen wurden.

d) Die Bemühungen der Kirchenväter um Einführung oder Verbreitung des Kirchenlieds waren von Erfolg gekrönt. Der hl. Ignatius z. B. wirkte dahingehend, daß der antiphonische Psalmengesang eine feststehende Einrichtung der Kirche wurde. Johannes Chrysostomus bejahte den liturgischen Hymnengesang und schätzte ihn sehr als ein wichtiges Mittel in den Händen der Kirche, die den Hymnengesang der Häretiker zu besiegen und zu vernichten suchte¹. Auch im Abendland waren die Kirchenväter tätig für die Schaffung oder Gestaltung des liturgischen Hymnengesangs. Ambrosius von Mailand z. B. wurde der Schöpfer des liturgischen Hymnengesangs in der abendländischen Kirche.

e) Die Verbindung des patristischen Geistes mit dem griechisch-orthodoxen Gottesdienst ist auch sehr klar darin zu sehen, daß zahlreiche Kirchenlieder großen Kirchenvätern zugeschrieben werden. Johannes von Damaskus dichtete z. B. liturgische Lieder von bleibendem Wert. Er „lebt in der griechischen Kirche auch durch seine teils metrischen, teils rhythmischen schwungvollen und warm empfundenen *Kirchenlieder* fort, die meist Feste des Herrn verherrlichen. Besonders berühmt sind seine Kanones, Gesänge, die aus 9 ihrem metrischen Bau und ihrer Melodie nach verschiedenen Liedern bestehen. Auch der *Oktoëchos*, der als Ganzes späteren Ursprungs ist, enthält nicht wenige von ihm gedichtete Lieder“². Im Abendland werden auch viele kirchliche Hymnen dem großen Ambrosius zugeschrieben oder ambrosianisch genannt³.

¹ K. Miliaras, *'Ιστορικὴ ἐπιμνήσης τοῦ Τριαδίου*, Jerusalem 1934, 45–46 und 43.

² B. Altaner, ebd., 488 und 490.

³ Ebd., 344–345.

f) Es gibt viele Beispiele, durch die die große Abhängigkeit der liturgischen Kirchenhymnen von den Predigten berühmter Kirchenväter bewiesen wird. Wir erwähnen einige von diesen Beispielen: N. Tomadakis hat bewiesen, daß die von Romanos dem Sänger gedichteten Hymnen sehr abhängig von den Kirchenvätern waren. Im besonderen waren sie abhängig von Athanasius, Johannes Chrysostomus, Basilius von Seleucia, Cyrill von Alexandrien, Gregor von Nyssa, Asterius von Amasea, Gregor dem Wundertäter, Cyrill von Jerusalem usw. Der patristische Einfluß auf Romanos ist nicht nur sichtbar im Inhalt seiner Hymnen, sondern auch in ihrer äußereren Form und Gestalt¹.

Basilius der Große beeinflußte auch die liturgischen Hymnen. Charakteristisch ist ein *Idiomelon* (= kurzes Kirchenlied mit eigener Melodie) in dem sogenannten *Triodion*. Dieses Kirchenlied, das in der großen Fastenzeit den Sinn des wahren Fastens erklärt, wurde wortwörtlich der zweiten Homilie von Basilius dem Großen über das Fasten² entnommen: Νηστεύσωμεν τηστελαν δεκτήν, ενάρεστον τῷ Κυρίῳ ἀληθῆς τηστελα, ἡ τῶν κακῶν ἀλλοτρίωσις, ἐγκράτεια γλώσσης, θνμοῦ ἀποχή, ἐπιθυμιῶν χωρισμός, καταλαϊᾶς, ψεύδονς καὶ ἐπιορκίας· ἡ τούτων ἔνδεια, τηστελα ἐστὶν ἀληθῆς καὶ εὐπρόσδεκτος³.

Gregor von Nazianz wirkte auch sehr stark auf die Entwicklung des griechisch-orthodoxen Gottesdienstes. Es ist bekannt, daß der erste *Eirmos* des Kanons von Kosma zur Geburt des Heilands fast wörtlich der Rede des hl. Gregor des Theologen Εἰς τὰ ἅγια Θεοφάνεια entnommen wurde⁴. Ebenso wurde der schöne Osterhymnus einer Osterrede desselben Kirchenvaters entnommen: Ἄναστάσεως ἡμέρα καὶ λαμπρυνθῶμεν τῇ πανηγύρει καὶ ἀλλήλους περιπτυξώμεθα . . .⁵ Der heilige Dorotheus erwähnt im 7. Jahrhundert Verse aus den Predigten Gregors des Theologen, die während des Gottesdienstes als ἐφόμια gesungen wurden. Solche ἐφόμια waren z. B. die Verse Ἄναστάσεως ἡμέρα, καρποφορήσωμεν ἡμᾶς αὐτούς und Ἰερεῖα ἔμψυχα, δλοκαν-

¹ Nik. Tomadakis, *Ρωμανικά μελετήματα*, 'Επετηρίς τῆς 'Εταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν, Athen 1956, 3–36.

² Migne PG 31, 196.

³ E. Theodorou, 'Η μορφωτικὴ ἀξία τοῦ ισχύοντος Τριῳδίου, Athen 1958, 68.

⁴ Migne PG 36, 312: Χριστὸς γεννᾶται, δοξάσατε· Χριστὸς ἐξ οὐρανῶν, ἀπαντήσατε· Χριστὸς ἐπὶ γῆς, ὑφάσθητε· "Ἄσατε τῷ Κυρίῳ πᾶσα ἡ γῆ . . .

⁵ Pan. Bratsiotis, 'Η Ἀνάστασις τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν τῇ Ὁρθοδόξῳ Ἐκκλησίᾳ, Zeitschrift 'Εκκλησία, I, Mai 1953, 129–135.

τώματα λογικά¹. Außerdem hat K. Bonis schon festgestellt, daß Sophronius von Jerusalem, der auch ein Kirchendichter war, „vielfach und geschickt das Wort und die Redensarten Gregors von Nazianz nachahmt“².

Charakteristisches Beispiel ist auch ein von Theophanes Graptoς gedichtetes Kirchenlied (*Idiomelon*) des Oster- samstags: Τὴν σήμερον μυστικῶς, ὁ μέγας Μωϋσῆς προδιετυπώστο λέγων· καὶ εὐλόγησεν ὁ Θεὸς τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἐβδόμην· τοῦτο γάρ ἔστι τὸ εὐλογημένον Σάββατον, αὕτη ἔστιν ἡ τῆς καταπαύσεως ἡμέρα, ἐν ᾧ κατέπαυσεν ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ . . . Dieser Hymnus wiederholt fast den folgenden Abschnitt der I. Rede des Kirchenvaters und Philosophen Gregor von Nyssa *Εἰς τὸ ἀγιον Πάσχα*: Καὶ θαυμάζεις τὸν ὑψηλὸν Μωϋσέα, τὸν πᾶσαν τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ κτίσιν διαλαβόντα τῇ δυνάμει τῆς γνώσεως; Ἰδού σοι τῆς πρώτης κοσμογονείας τὸ εὐλογημένον Σάββατον. Γνώρισον δι’ ἔκεινον τοῦ Σαββάτου τοῦτο τὸ Σάββατον, τὴν τῆς καταπαύσεως ἡμέραν, ἣν εὐλόγησεν ὁ Θεὸς ὑπὲρ τὰς ἄλλας ἡμέρας· ἐν ταύτῃ γάρ κατέπαυσεν ἀληθῶς ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ ὁ Μονογενῆς Θεός³.

Alle diese Beispiele stehen in Einklang mit der Nachricht, die uns der heilige Dorotheus gibt: Διὰ τοῦτο καλόν ἔστι τὸ φάλλειν ἐκ τῶν λόγων τῶν ἀγίων θεοφόρων (πατέρων), ἐπειδὴ πανταχοῦ σπουδάζουσιν ἀεὶ διδάσκειν ἡμᾶς πάντα τὰ συντελούντα πρός φωτισμὸν τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν· ἐν οἷς καὶ πρόκειται ἡμῖν ἐξ αὐτῶν τῶν προσφόρων λόγων, καὶ αὐτὴν τὴν δύναμιν τῆς ἐπιτελουμένης μητήμης ἀεὶ μανθάνειν, εἴτε δεσποτική ἔστιν ἕορτή, εἴτε ἀγίων μαρτύρων, εἴτε πατέρων ἀπλῶς, οὐα δήποτε ἡμέρα ἀγία καὶ ἐπιφανής⁴.

g) Der patristische Geist ist auch sichtbar in der griechisch-orthodoxen liturgischen Kunst. Der kirchlich-dogmatische Charakter der griechisch-orthodoxen Ikonenmalerei und der theologische Gehalt der Ikonen gehen auf die Lehre der Kirchenväter zurück. Die römisch-katholische Kunst stellt Christus, die Gottesmutter, die Engel und die Heiligen realistisch in unserer Umwelt hier auf Erden dar. Die griechisch-orthodoxe Kunst dagegen malt sie in den Ikonen überirdisch verklärt im Himmel.

¹ Dorotheos, *Διδασκαλίαι ψυχωρελεῖς*, Migne PG 88, 1822 und 1829.

² K. Bonis, *Σωρρόνιος Ἱεροσολύμων ὡς θεολόγος, ἐγκωμιαστής καὶ ἔγραφος*, Athen 1958, 23.

³ Migne PG 46, 601. Pan. Bratsiotis, ebd. 130–131. E. Theodorou, ebd. 66.

⁴ Dorotheus, ebd., Migne PG 88, 1829.

In den orthodoxen Ikonen schauen Christus und die Heiligen aus ihrer Welt des göttlichen Lichtes auf uns hernieder¹. Man wird die Sonderart und den liturgischen Charakter der griechisch-orthodoxen Ikonenmalerei noch besser verstehen, wenn man weiß, daß diese Sonderart und dieser liturgische Charakter dem patristischen Geist und der patristischen Tradition entspricht. Das 7. Ökumenische Konzil betonte, daß sich die Ikonenmalerei unter dem Einfluß des patristischen Geistes fortentwickelt: *Τῶν ζωγράφων ἐφεύρεσις ἡ τῶν εἰκόνων ποίησις, ἀλλὰ τῆς καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας ἔγκριτος θεσμοθεσία καὶ παράδοσις . . . Αὐτῶν (τῶν πατέρων) ἡ ἐπίνοια καὶ παράδοσις καὶ οὐ τοῦ ζωγράφου. Τοῦ γὰρ ζωγράφου ἡ τέχνη μόνον· ἡ δὲ διάταξις τῶν δειμαμένων ἀγ. Πατέρων*². So hat die Lehre der Kirchenväter die Haupttypen der Ikonen und ihre dogmatische Rechtfertigung beeinflußt.

h) Viele der liturgischen Gebräuche wurden durch die ununterbrochenen Ermahnungen der Kirchenväter verbreitet. Für die Fastenzeiten gibt es z. B. viele Predigten der großen Kirchenväter, die den Sinn und die Nützlichkeit des wahren Fastens erwähnen. Das Kreuzzeichen wird noch heute vom orthodoxen Volk ganz in Übereinkunft mit den Ermahnungen der alten Kirchenväter gebraucht. So empfahl schon Cyrill von Jerusalem, was die Gläubigen in Griechenland, der Sowjetunion, Jugoslawien usw. heute noch tun: „Schämen wir uns des Kreuzes Christi nicht³ . . . Machen wir das Kreuzzeichen mutig mit der Hand auf die Stirn, und zwar bei jeder Gelegenheit: beim Essen und Trinken, wenn wir eintreten und ausgehen, bevor wir einschlafen, wenn wir uns zur Ruhe legen und aufstehen. Es ist ein großer Schutz unentgeltlich für die Armen, leicht für die Schwachen, denn Gott gibt ja die Gnade. Es ist ein Schutzzeichen für die Gläubigen und ein Schreckbild für die bösen Geister, denn in ihm hat er über sie triumphiert“⁴.

i) Von unschätzbarem Wert für die Geschichte des Gottesdienstes sind die Werke der Kirchenväter überhaupt. Diese Werke enthalten Nachrichten und Mitteilungen über die einzelnen Kulthandlungen, die Taufe und die Eucharistie, die am

¹ W. de Vries, *Die Ostkirchen*, 1963, 27.

² K. Kalokyris, *Η θεμελιώδης προϋπόθεσις τῆς ἐρμηνείας τῆς βυζαντινῆς ζωγραφικῆς* (‘Εναρκτήριος λόγος), Thessaloniki 1962, 8.

³ Migne PG 33, 472.

⁴ Migne PG 33, 816. J. Daniélou, *ebd.* 67.

Osterfest empfangenen Sakramente, die Berechnung der kirchlichen Festzeiten usw. „Als sich der Katechumenat herausgebildet hatte, wurde es üblich, den Täuflingen eine Katechese über die Sakramente zu halten, die sie empfangen sollten. Glücklicherweise besitzen wir einige dieser Sakraments-Katechesen, die im Verlauf der Osterwoche gehalten wurden. Diese Dokumente stammen aus verschiedenen Orten und Zeiten. Als wichtigste seien genannt: Die mystagogischen Katechesen Cyrills von Jerusalem, die Schriften *De Mysteriis* und *De Sacramentis* des Ambrosius von Mailand, die katechetischen Homilien Theodors von Mopsuestia und schließlich noch die Abhandlung *De ecclesiastica Hierarchia* von Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita“¹.

In verschiedenen Schriften der Kirchenväter sind auch Stellen anzutreffen, die sich auf die Symbolik der liturgischen Riten und Gebräuche beziehen. So findet sich, um nur ein Beispiel anzu führen, im Traktat *Περὶ ἀγῶνα Πνεύματος* des heiligen Basilius die Sinndeutung einer ganzen Reihe von Riten: Ostrichtung beim Gebet, Stehen beim Gebet usw.².

Die mystagogischen Katechesen der Kirchenväter befassen sich im besonderen nur mit den Sakramenten. Der christliche Kult umfaßt aber darüber hinaus noch andere Riten, die an Sinngehalt ebenso reich sind. Man denke insbesondere an den Festkreis des Kirchenjahres. Auch hierüber besitzen wir wertvolle Zeugnisse, nämlich die Homilien, die an den Hochfesten des Kirchenjahres gehalten wurden³.

In meinem Büchlein *Tὸ ὁρθόδοξον λειτουργικὸν ή μυσταγωγικὸν κτήσιγμα*⁴ („Die orthodoxe liturgische oder mystagogische Predigt“) berichte ich u. a. darüber, daß es auf dem Berg Athos in Griechenland viele alte Handschriften gibt, die reiche Sammlungen von liturgischen Predigten der Kirchenväter enthalten.

Für den Sinngehalt der Osterzeit sind außer den Homilien auch noch die Festbriefe der alexandrinischen Bischöfe zu erwähnen und heranzuziehen, die sie ihren Pfarrkindern zu Beginn der Fastenzeit zu senden pflegten und in denen man die Urform der Hirtenbriefe sehen könnte. Die ältesten stammen von Athanasius. Auch von Cyril von Alexandrien existiert eine Sammlung solcher Briefe⁵.

¹ J. Daniélou, ebd. 17.

² Ebd. 24.

³ Ebd. 24–25.

⁴ Athen 1960.

⁵ J. Daniélou, ebd. 25.

So ist klar, daß alle diese Werke der Kirchenväter nicht nur liturgiegeschichtlich sehr wichtig sind, sondern zugleich einen Schlüssel von außerordentlicher Bedeutung liefern, der uns das echte Verständnis der Sakramente und liturgischen Riten erschließt¹ und zur liturgischen Bildung der orthodoxen Gemeinden beitragen kann.

Das sind die wichtigsten Punkte, aus denen wir meiner Meinung nach die Beziehungen der Kirchenväter zum griechisch-orthodoxen Gottesdienst ersehen können.

¹ Vgl. ebd. 5.

Recent Developments in the Study of the Old-Roman Rite

S. J. P. VAN DIJK O. F. M., London

For the last conference I was invited to survey the studies on what, since 1950, had developed into the problem of the Old-Roman, pre-Gregorian, Special chant, or whatever name one may like to give it. This turned out to be an interesting experience. The kind of survey one would expect from an impartial outsider was never given. Instead I ventured to analyze the problem by taking an active part in the discussions. I, first, attempted to justify the need for a different approach to the problem as a whole and, secondly, added another theory on the origins and history of Old-Roman to the then prevailing hypotheses¹.

The discussions following that paper were most helpful. After the conference copies with the various comments were circulated among those interested. And shortly after that I dared to develop my hypothesis in a long article which, in some way, incorporated all the points raised. The editor of *Sacris Erudiri* was kind enough to print it in the volume for 1961².

Looking back I am not sure whether those events have actually promoted intenser study or wider interest. I myself, of course, am convinced that they have, at least, thrown some light upon the issue. But the absence of explicit criticism or approval, except in private correspondence, can be explained in more than one way! One point seems to become clear. If in the fifties scholars were conscious of being faced with a complicated musicological problem – W. Apel had already called it the ‘central’ problem of Gregorian chant³ – it now looks as though the early medieval

¹ The Old-Roman rite, in *Studia Patristica. Papers presented to the third international conference on patristic studies . . . Sept. 1959*, vol. V, in *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristl. Literatur*, Bd. 80, 1962, 185 ff.

² The Urban and Papal Rites in Seventh and Eighth-century Rome, in *Sacris Erudiri* [SE] 12, 1961, 411 ff.

³ In the *Journal of American Musicology* 9, 1957, 118 ff.

history of the Roman liturgy and its chant has to be rewritten. This sounds dramatic but, if I read the signs well, it is not in the least exaggerated.

In order to clarify the importance of what is happening, you may like to hear a few points recapitulated. Up to the last Patristic Conference the few late-medieval manuscripts with an older type of Gregorian chant had drawn the attention mainly of musicologists. In their comparative studies into the relationship between Old-Roman and Gregorian melodies, they obviously were tempted to seek the origins of the two repertoires and to apply their ideas to the records already known. Thus the *status quaestionis* and the attempts at an answer remained predominantly musicological. The renewed interest in the history of the *schola cantorum* is typical in this respect.

Those who have developed a real, musicological theory admit that the origins of Old-Roman chant must be sought in Rome. But they disagree on the dating, purpose and development of this repertoire as well as on almost everything connected with Gregorian chant: date, purpose, development and origins. To B. Stäblein, who made the problem acute, both chants belonged to one Roman liturgy: Old-Roman is a relic of the local chant, while Gregorian is a papal version dating from the mid-seventh century onwards. J. Smits van Waesberghe also places the origins of both chants in Rome. But to him Old-Roman is a relic of the oldest, secular and papal chant, Gregorian a monastic version, developed since the seventh century. H. Hucke, J. Handschin, L. Brou, Gajard and others of the school of Solesmes, each in his own way, determine Old-Roman as just Roman; they either claim a Frankish origin for Gregorian or do not commit themselves on this point. W. Apel admits a Frankish origin of Gregorian, but he does not see it as an art-form derived from Old-Roman but as a parallel evolution. He also places its origins two hundred years later than the others, in the ninth and tenth centuries. This because Gregorian chant is first found in manuscripts of that time and the author rejects the possibility of oral tradition during such a prolonged period. Most of these theories – some are no more than a few, often repeated ideas – were already explained in articles by Hucke and by J. H[ourlier?]!¹. Now they

¹ Zu einigen Problemen der Choralforschung, in Die Musikforschung 11, 1958, 385 ff.; Etudes grégoriennes 3, 1959, 188 ff.

are all recorded in detail by E. Jammers in his latest book, a return to which will be made presently.

From the beginning I have objected to the musicological limitation of the problem, asking for an extension to the whole field of medieval liturgy: strictly liturgical books, *ordines* and ceremonials as well as chronicles, records, etc. on public worship. M. Huglo, collecting the direct and indirect sources of Old-Roman chant, was the first to draw attention to liturgical implications. Still, the title of his study¹ shows how he wished to clarify a musicological issue with liturgical details. The same must be said of the minute analysis by G. Frénaud of one of Huglo's indirect sources, a missal from Sant'Eutizio's, Norcia, MS Rome, bibl. Vallicelliana, B. 8². Working with purely liturgical material, Frénaud tried to establish whether this missal is, indeed, an indirect source of Old-Roman chant, in other words, whether this Mass book required an Old-Roman gradual. His answer is in the negative. Elsewhere I have explained why there can be no question of indirect sources of Old-Roman chant in this sense. The reason is that such manuscripts as the missal under discussion are a mixture of Gregorian and Old-Roman texts. The question of the relationship between noted and not-noted books in the middle ages is beside the point and of little consequence³.

In asking for a liturgical approach to the problem one, obviously, does not ignore that several studies of the last decade have recorded important points of duality in the Roman liturgy. But they baffled rather than inspired the authors to pursuing the consequences of their observations. Nor did, unfortunately, any musicologist integrate them into his theory. By now everything points to the fact that we are faced with an essentially liturgical problem to which questions of chant are important but subsidiary. This is a problem of rites; and a solution must ultimately come from liturgical history.

Both my claim in favour of all-round study of the Roman rites – rather than chants – and my studies in the late-medieval Roman liturgy suggested another hypothesis. Accepting a Roman origin of both rites, I define Old-Roman chant as belonging to

¹ Le chant 'vieux-romain'. Liste des manuscrits et témoins indirects, in SE 6, 1954, 96 ff.

² Les témoins indirects du chant liturgique en usage à Rome au IX^e et X^e siècles, in Etudes grégoriennes 3, 1959, 41 ff.

³ See Urban and Papal Rites, 446.

the oldest rite of the city of Rome (the urban rite), which up to the middle of the seventh century was the liturgy of the pope and his diocese. To me Gregorian chant originated with a new papal liturgy that developed, mainly from the second half of the seventh century, not just under the influence of but, as a conscious imitation of, the majestic court ceremonial of Byzantium. At first sight, I may seem to have developed or adapted Stäblein's idea. In actual fact, I came to another theory through study of and correspondence with Smits van Waesberghe and Jammers. Moreover, apart from the fact that my approach is basically liturgical, one must see that two different chants cannot have been expressions of one rite¹. They must be one of several, equally striking differences between two rites, both of which involved the West at early stages of their existence (see scheme pp. 304 f.).

You would scarcely appreciate it if I were to pour out to you a kind of reasoned bibliography, touching upon everything connected with the Old-Roman rite or chant. I prefer to deal with some of the outstanding issues that present themselves for discussion, and place them against the church historical background in general. Hence I wish to deal with three main topics: chant, liturgy and Byzantinism. The first two are directly connected with the Old-Roman (urban), the third with the Gregorian (papal) rite.

Chant

The fact that within one decade so many musicological theories have been developed – and are still being put forward – must necessarily be felt as a sign of weakness. Actually, this multiplicity was the reason why, in 1958, at the seventh congress of the International Musicological Society, the Gregorian experts came together at Cologne in an *Arbeitsgemeinschaft* in order to come to some agreement. Unfortunately, the result was nil². No doubt, there were and still are extenuating circumstances. More than half a century of intense musicological research without any

¹ This to a liturgist rather unhistorical assumption is also made by Jammers, op. cit. below, 108.

² Bericht, ed. G. Abraham - C. Clerx - H. Federhofer - W. Pfankuch, Kassel, Basle, London, New York 1959.

real knowledge of Old-Roman and then the sudden interest in an entirely new, or rather entirely ignored but very old form of chant, these two produce a clash which, in itself, creates intricate problems. Traditional attitudes (to use a socio-psychological term) become treacherous. To integrate a far-reaching historical problem into one's normal way of thinking and reading is a slow process. It is difficult to change one's mind, even about an hypothesis! This holds *a fortiori* for those who wish to see it not as a problem of chant alone but of liturgy in its widest sense. Moreover, the sources listed so far are few: they scarcely allow one to draw general conclusions, though they are a wonderful excuse for sweeping theories. Many more sources will come to light¹, but most of those known are not available in print: quick checking and counterchecking – so necessary for a good hypothesis – is out of the question.

But there are deeper grounds suggesting that, musicologically, we are on the wrong track. If a comparison be allowed: we are on the same wrong track along which the study of 'the' Roman liturgy went since P. Batiffol wrote his *Histoire du breviaire* early in this century. S. Bäumer at once rejected his presentation of the late-medieval court liturgy and the part played by the Friars Minor. Both Batiffol and Bäumer actually presented hypotheses, as the documents were not discovered until 1927 and 1939 and only part of them is just published². Nevertheless, within two decades almost everybody touching on the subject, conveniently forgetting hypotheses and all that, gave an opinion, *gratis* and as a favour; not a few gave it as gospel truth. Consequently, changes here, new touches there; vivid colours today, more shading tomorrow, a real collection of liturgical action paintings, quite useful to the apologists crying or thinking aloud back-to-the-ancient-church. But for historical insight they produced a thorough mess which *The Origins of the Modern Roman Liturgy* has not yet cleared away. Now the origins of the Old-Roman liturgy threaten to go the same way and for similar rea-

¹ Elements are found in the missal portion of the Breviary of St Clare; see S. J. P. van Dijk - J. Hazelden Walker, *The Origins of the Modern Roman Liturgy. The Liturgy of the Papal Court and the Franciscan Order in the Thirteenth Century*, London, Westminster, Md., 1960, 136.

² The court ordinal (Innocent III) will be edited in *Spicilegium Friburgense*. – S. J. P. van Dijk, *Sources of the Modern Roman Liturgy. The Ordinals by Haymo of Faversham and Related Documents (1243–1307)*, 2 vols., Leiden 1963.

URBAN RITE	
WESTERN	LOCAL (cantus romanus)
England: Augustine, Theodore, etc.	Gregory I (590–604) daily <i>Missae publicae</i> St Peter's and St Paul's, foundation of two branches of schola cantorum for Vatican and Lateran
Gertrude of Nivelles (625–659) request for Roman books	Honorius I (625–638) <i>divino in carmine pollens</i>
Gozo of Fontenelle (c. 665) obtains Roman books	Catolenus, Maurianus, Virbonus, abbots of Vatican monastery (-ies) liturgists chanters
Amand of Maastricht (648–684) request for Roman books	John abbot of St Martin's, archchanter of St Peter's (before 679), Vatican branch of schola
John, abbot of St Martin's, teaches in England (after 679)	model of <i>Ord. Rom. XIV, XV, XVI, XVIII, XIX: Missae publicae</i> , St. Peter's centre of liturgical life of faithful; details of <i>Regula Magistri</i> and Rule of St Benedict
Putta of Rochester (before 688); monks of Canterbury, imitators of St Peter's, Vatican	8th-century central-Italian missals with writing technique for adiastematic notation
St Gall collection <i>Ord. Rom. XIV</i> , etc. (after 681); monks imitators of St Peter's, Vatican	8th-century Rome two different systems of patristic reading at the Office: urban collection goes back, at least, to 6th century
Wala of Corbie (826–836) obtains books of the urban rite	

PAPAL RITE	
LOCAL (cantus Ecclesiae Romanae)	WESTERN
609 <i>terminus post quem</i> station lists	
7th-century <i>littera curialis</i> , Byzantine Vitalian (657–672), peace with emperor, schola for papal chant (<i>Vitaliani</i>), based on Lateran branch	
Adeodatus (672–676) first record of papal schola	
<i>Ordo Romanus I</i> (late 7th century); strong Byzantine influence	
Gregory II (715–731) (<i>Gregorius praesul, iunior</i>) <i>antiphonale missarum</i> , station sacramentary (Hadrianum)	Attempts at introduction (719) Bavaria, later Boniface
Hadrian I (d. 795): two clerics of Charlemagne smuggled into papal schola, Rome	England, Cloveshoe (747) introduction station sacramentary, <i>antiphonarium missarum?</i> Gaul, Pepin, introduction; monastic prototype Young Gelasianum (c. 750), includes Hadrianum; first mission of papal chanters Charlemagne; Stephen III (d. 772) sent 12 chanters; opposition of schola to liturgical movement; discussion Rome, 774? Hadrianum sent to Charlemagne (784–791); official adaptation of Young Gelasianum (Frankfurt, 794?) Alcuin's elaboration of Hadrianum (801–804)

sons. How strikingly similar the process is may be gathered from the fact that in certain 'authoritative' circles the Frankish origin of Gregorian chant is already taken as a starting-point for manuscript research, although, since Hucke launched the idea, no serious attempt has been made to integrate this theory historically, for instance, by explaining why the Roman rather than the Gallican psalter underlies the Gregorian gradual. Musicology and liturgy have inherited too much specialized isolation and superficiality from the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of this century.

Both fields of historical research are too much on their own. The importance of background is poorly appreciated; hence students get no help from it either. Chant is hardly ever a real part of worship, while the latter is seldom seen as an expression of a contemporary social order. Musicologists and liturgists alike accept principles of research, in theory and practice, that make 'ordinary historians' shudder. If, for example, one doubts the Roman origin of Gregorian chant because the oldest graduals come from the North, one cannot quietly continue to ascribe the corresponding sacramentary to Gregory the Great. Here too by far the greatest number of ancient manuscripts come from the North. The facts that we have a letter of Hadrian I about a copy of a Roman sacramentary sent to Charlemagne and that we have no such thing about the gradual does not allow one to admit the Roman origin of the one and to reject it for the other. We are willing to excuse musicologists unfamiliar with sacramentaries and lectionaries. But there is no excuse for not realising that a gradual is only one of the Mass books that contained the *cantus* (i. e. *ordo, ritus*) *Ecclesiae Romanae*. The lack of documents allows for logic, not for wishful thinking. The common type goes along these lines, cited from the *Études grégoriennes* of 1962: '*Prenant comme base, les deux listes romains . . . qui nous sont fournies par les antiphonaires romains du XI^e et du XIII^e s., nous les anticipons en pensée au VIII^e s. . . En soi, ce fait n'a rien d'étonnant . . .*'¹ Another eloquent example of playing with medieval terms is the medieval portion of the article 'Rom' in the latest issue of *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart*². Even my own contribution on the history of the schola is nicely edited to suit the crime. All this is not research but throwing one's weight about in solitude.

¹ P. 122.

² MGG 1963, col. 692 ff.

Last year's publication of E. Jammers, *Musik in Byzanz, im päpstlichen Rom und in Frankenreich*¹ is, apart from an important and welcome event in the study of the Old-Roman chant, a typical example of another weakness of this research. Jammers is very conscious of the fact that church musicology is following a lonely path that leads nowhere². The title of his work shows how he is feeling his way towards integration. Still, he was unable to throw off the burden of tradition to which he objects. He observes, for instance, that musicology cannot come to any conclusion on the origins of the two repertoires before the differences between the idioms are established³. True to this statement, Jammers has honestly laboured to become the first attempting a general and already precious comparison between the various musical forms of the two chants.

One may, indeed, doubt whether, even in musicological terms, this statement enounces a correct principle of historical research. But granted that it is, the objection must still be that, in practice, Jammers sees the problem within most restricted limits. Clearly, a study of idioms of liturgical chants cannot establish these idioms by chant alone but through the idioms of the rites to which they belong and of which they are an expression. Unfortunately, the idioms of the two rites are scarcely known, not forgetting, of course, that the idea of two rites is only just emerging. More unfortunate still is that the necessary comparison of musical forms and idioms is such that no definite conclusions can be drawn⁴. This is not due to any direct fault on the part of Prof. Jammers but to the climate of Gregorian studies. Since P. Wagner they have been almost obsessed with analyses of modes, phrases, forms and neums. However useful for an understanding of a thing from the past, they produce little if that thing is not of the past, if the thing has no past, if its place in time is not tangible. And to return to Old-Roman: comparison of an historically badly established Gregorian repertoire with a hitherto unknown form of Old-Roman chant cannot result in something concrete. The one hangs just as much 'in the air' as the other.

Hucke observed that '*Die Musikwissenschaft steht in allen die Datierung und Herkunft von Melodien dieser Zeit betreffenden*

¹ In *Abhandlungen der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften. Phil.-hist. Klasse*, 1962, 1. Abhandlung, Heidelberg 1962.

² Op. cit., 117. ³ Op. cit., 125f.

⁴ Op. cit., 126–163.

*Fragen noch in den ersten Anfängen.*¹ Jammers's work makes it again patent that what are needed, first and foremost, are dates and places to melodies and texts or, at least, lists of items each with a *terminus ante* and/or *post quem*. Liturgists should provide us with lists of items textually common to both repertoires and with lists of those proper to one or the other. Musicologists should prepare more *repertoria* alongside Chevalier's *Repertorium hymnologicum*, lists of text and melodies. A beginning, indeed, is made by Stäblein in the first volume of the *Monumenta monodica medii aevi* with medieval hymns. Yet the choice of the material is, from the liturgist's point of view, unsatisfactory. The dates and places, moreover, are still too vague.

We need alphabetical lists and serialised antiphons, responsories, verses, kyriale melodies, etc. We need collations of indices to dated and placed manuscripts. We need exactly the means that are so lavishly available to biblical scholarship. Is this wishing for the moon? Then what about some smaller projects? There is the great number of office antiphons taken from the psalms. It is generally accepted that they represent the oldest form of antiphonal singing. And there is no doubt either that, throughout the middle ages, the number of these antiphons increased steadily. What about a textual and musical genealogy with dates and places? A foretaste of the complications involved may be had from the analysis by R. Le Roux of the antiphons and psalms at matins and lauds of Christmas and New Year in the Roman and monastic *cursus*². The mass of material displayed in this contribution is such that I have been as yet unable to absorb it. But one hopes that it is more convincing than his comparison of the Sunday graduals after Pentecost in the same periodical last year³.

Collaboration between musicologists and liturgists, both palaeographers and historians, is urgently needed. It may be the only hope for a solution of the relationship between Old-Roman and Gregorian.

I do not wish to imply even that there are no good historians in our fields of study. Read anything by Smits van Waesberghe or

¹ Eine unbekannte Melodie zu den Laudes regiae, in Kirchenmusikalisches Jahrbuch 42, 1958, 37.

² Les antennes et les psaumes pour Noël et le 1^{er} janvier selon les *cureus* romain et monastique, in Etudes grégoriennes 4, 1961, 65 ff.

³ Les graduels des dimanches après la Pentecôte, in Etudes grégoriennes 5, 1962, 119 ff.

by Deshusses, to mention only two. Nor do I wish to underestimate the dangers of today: history is out, even the liturgical movement no longer wishes to be historical; a theological training is still regarded as an adequate preparation to liturgical studies; such expressions as Institute of Historical Liturgy belong, for most, to the realm of incomprehensible modern poetry. Yet, once we recognise the problem under discussion, it must be treated as an all-round historical one. As such it will cause plenty of trouble. But none of this matters, provided the mistakes are not fundamental.

I just mentioned dated melodies. We now have three idioms of the series of antiphons *Veterem hominem* for the octave day of the Epiphany: Gregorian, Old-Roman and Byzantine. In 802 or more probably in 813 the Greeks sang these antiphons at the court of Charlemagne at Aix-la-Chapelle. The emperor was so pleased with them that he ordered the melodies to be copied with a Latin translation of the text. This is the Gregorian version. The Old-Roman one is younger than that of Charlemagne, but it agrees most with the Byzantine idiom which is younger still. Thus we are still unable to determine whether we have purely Byzantine melodies in those of Charlemagne¹; another instance showing how, even with some definite material at hand, the problems remain intricate.

A most valuable and durable contribution towards a solution of the issue will be the facsimile edition, transcription and introductory studies of the Roman gradual, written in 1071 for the church of St Cecilia, Rome, and now in the Bodmer library at Cologny-Genève. The publication was promised for this year. Because of serious illness of the editor, Prof. Brenn, who has just returned to work, it is planned for next year. Little definite can be expected until a *corpus* of facsimile editions of all chant books is available. Any institute wishing to perpetuate its name should contribute to this work of social assistance. The Mediaeval and Plainsong Society in this country, for instance, would render a great service, if they could see their way to issuing an edition of the still enigmatic but beautiful nocturnal in the British Museum, Add. 29988, already listed by Huglo.

A great promise is implied in a discovery by K. Gamber². On a photograph accompanying his transcription of an eighth-century

¹ See Smits van Waesberghe in Kirchenmusikalisches Jahrbuch 46, 1962, 63f.

² Fragment eines mittelitalienischen Plenarmissale aus dem 8. Jahrhundert, in Ephemorides liturgicae [EL] 76, 1962, 333ff.

fragment of a central-Italian missal, the text of the chanted parts appears to be smaller than that of prayers and lessons. This writing technique, common in most breviaries and missals of the later middle ages and slavishly followed in print for centuries, was inspired by the need for notation – adiastematic neums – which could easily be placed between the lines of the reduced text. The fragment in question has no neums and perhaps belonged to a book that was never intended to have it. Still, since the technique was adopted in the eighth century, central-Italy at least must have known notation at an earlier stage. The importance of this conclusion is obvious¹. So far we know of some neums of circa 700 in the *liber orationum* from Tarragona, now at Verona². But our oldest melodies all come from north of the Alps and do not go beyond the early ninth century³. What is more, none of the oldest Gregorian (papal) graduals have any notation⁴. I have placed this well-known but unexplained fact against the background of the opposition of the papal schola to Charlemagne's liturgical reform and of the subsequent dispute between Frankish chanters and the schola perhaps in 774⁵. As the papal liturgy and chant were purposely devised as expressions of the pope's western sovereignty, the schola could scarcely agree that their prerogative was being propagated as a symbol of the new kingdom. Hence they attempted – in vain – to wreck the reform. The lack of notation in the early graduals may well be another sign of the schola's opposition. The fact now discovered that notation existed strengthens this idea. The Old-Roman rite did not enter into the dispute, nor was it any longer a concern of the papal schola. The discovery also means that finds of noted fragments much earlier than those already known are neither impossible nor improbable. We may now hopefully search for

¹ See the contradictory assumption of H. Hucke, Die gregorianischen Gradualweisen des 2. Tons und ihre ambrosianischen Parallelen, in Archiv für Musikwissenschaft 13, 1956, 311.

² H. Anglès in Archiv für Musikwissenschaft 16, 1959, 6.

³ Smits van Waesberghe, Over het ontstaan van sequenz en prosula en beider oorspronkelijke uitvoeringswijze, in Orgaan K. V. T. V. Officieel maandblad van de koninklijke nederlandse toonkunstenaarsvereeniging 12, 1957, 51 ff.

⁴ R.-J. Hesbert, Antiphonale Missarum sextuplex, Brussels 1935.

⁵ Papal schola versus Charlemagne, in Organicae voces. Festschrift Joseph Smits van Waesberghe angeboten anlässlich seines 60. Geburtstages 18. April 1961, Amsterdam 1963, 21 ff.

them. What is more important perhaps, the idea that, before the ninth century, oral tradition prevailed must be abolished (Apel).

Liturgy

As the first claim for a liturgical approach to the problem was not published until the end of 1960¹, it is still too early to expect any direct response. Nevertheless, three events seem to indicate that this aspect of the theory has its real value. The idea of coexisting urban and papal rites in Rome from the mid-seventh century is no longer a mere hypothesis but rather a good working method. The correct way to make an hypothesis work is to find a satisfactory explanation for as many known facts as possible. A line of evolution should present itself without distortion of either the documents or their background. Things should fall into place rather than being fitted.

1. It is not difficult to see that, if Gregorian, i. e. the typically papal chant and liturgy, are products of the seventh and eighth centuries, the name of Gregory the Great does not fit here. It cannot be connected with the *antiphonale missarum* or gradual, nor with the papal station sacramentary such as the *Hadrianum*, nor with the foundation of the papal *schola cantorum*. In all three cases we have to do with long-standing and venerated traditions, which, however, have continually been attacked even by scholars of repute. In two of the three cases I have tried to establish the origins of and the reasons for those beliefs; the answers fit automatically into the hypothesis.

a) Many copies of the gradual are prefaced by some verses opening with the line *Gregorius praesul, nomine et meritis dignus*, ascribed to Hadrian I. These verses urgently require a critical edition. This not only because of their subsequent embellishments and distortions but, particularly, to establish their oldest, perhaps original version. The latter, as far as I can judge, includes in the third line the term *iunior* which contemporary sources apply to Gregory II, Stephen II, Leo II, Gregory III (*secundus iunior*) and even Boniface IV². In this manner the book is explicitly introduced as the work of Gregory II. Like Gregory the

¹ *Urban and Papal Rites*, 411, 446.

² References in van Dijk, *Gregory the Great Founder of the Urban schola cantorum*, in *EL* 77, 1963, 220.

Great he was born in Rome (2nd line: *Unde genus dicit sumnum consendit honorem*), where, again like his predecessor, he restored (*Qui renovans*, 3rd line, or *Renovavit*) *monumenta patrum iuniorumque priorum*. Gregory I could not be said to have been *meritis et nomine dignus*, if *nomen* refers to the proper name *Gregorius*: he was only worthy of the name *praesul*. But Gregory II was worthy of both, the name *Gregorius*, thanks to his illustrious predecessor, and the title *praesul*, thanks to his own merits. I have already stressed elsewhere¹ how it came about that these two Gregories were mixed up from the early ninth century at least. And it is highly probable that the term *iunior* is absent from many copies of these verses simply because it was purposely dropped in order to make Gregory II into Gregory the Great (with stress on the Great). Once the switch was made and accepted, the muddle in the hexameter had to be mended and the praises of the Great pontiff were sung with an ever increasing number of verses.

b) If, as it is claimed, there is such close relationship between the content of this gradual of Gregory II and the Hadrian sacramentary, it sounds as though the Thursday Masses in Lent, introduced by the same and found in the *Hadrianum*, cannot be regarded as additions to an older book of the same content but must be taken as essentials, dating this book as an early eighth-century compilation and no more. The existence of an older station sacramentary of the same type and content must be proved, not assumed or concocted by eliminating those items that can be dated later than Gregory the Great. Nor can the name *Gregorius* in the title of the *Hadrianum* be taken as a record concerning Gregory the Great. At this point I would have liked you to hear what C. Coebergh writes in a paper presented to this conference *in absentia*². Moreover, if Hadrian I took care to preface the gradual, indicating Gregory II as the compiler, the shorter title to the sacramentary he sent to Charlemagne should first be taken as referring to the same Gregory II. And even if Hadrian meant to refer to Gregory the Great (*quod probandum*), it must still be proved that he was not a victim of an erroneous tradition. Not that we are hypercritical or distrust Hadrian's knowledge but because, at the time, there was confusion, created

¹ Urban and Papal Rites, 476 ff.; Gregory the Great 220.

² See his contribution in this volume pp. 176–188.

by the enthusiasm of the Carolingians for great names and traditions. As my knowledge of the manuscript tradition is far too sketchy, I hesitate to draw positive conclusions. It seems, however, that fruitful work could be done on the connection some manuscripts make between the name *Gregorius* and the *orationes cotidianaes*, possibly a *libellus sacramentorum*¹. Here, indeed, we have something tangible. The *liber pontificalis* ascribes to Gregory the Great the institution of daily *Missae publicae* at the basilicas of St Peter's and of Paul's².

c) If the special papal liturgy and chant did not exist in the days of Gregory the Great – all station lists have the year 607 as a *terminus post quem* – he cannot have founded a papal schola, i. e. a body of chanters with specific and exclusive duties at the station liturgy. In fact, reading John the Deacon on the subject, it is easily seen that he does not say anything of the kind. Yet, since the last century, we have been assuming that he did so, because the only Roman schola that reached fame was the papal one. The humble continuation of the urban schola alongside the papal institute can no longer be denied. In the next issue of the *Ephemerides liturgicae*³ I hope to introduce Gregory the Great as the founder of the urban schola, a body of chanters living in two houses on either side of the city, near St Peter's and St John's, and performing Old-Roman chant at all solemn occasions, stations as well as daily *Missae publicae*.

2. An important contribution to the issue of urban and papal rites is the study by G. Frénaud on the cult of our Lady in the ancient Latin liturgy⁴, where he shows how the seventh- and eighth-century feasts of the Virgin each had different Mass formulae in the sacramentaries. One must, however, deplore the tendency of the author to antedate texts and customs far beyond the testimony of the manuscripts and to connect the papal rite with Gregory the Great. The same must be said of Le Roux's discussion on the double series of graduals after Pentecost. Still, the duality of this series points in the same direction as the

¹ K. Gamber, Sacramentartypen, in *Texte und Arbeiten...* Beuron, Heft 49–50, Beuron 1958, 91f.

² See Gregory the Great, 225f.

³ See above, p. 311, note 2.

⁴ Le culte de Notre Dame dans l'ancienne liturgie latine, in *Maria. Etudes sur la sainte Vierge*, ed. H. du Manoir, vol. 6, Paris 1961, 157ff.

existence of two series of patristic reading for the office, recorded by Löw some years ago¹.

3. The third contribution comes from K. Hallinger in a revealing study on the origins of Andrieu's *Ordines Romani XIV, XV, XVI, XVIII and XIX* (the so-called St Gall collection)². Silva Tarouca had claimed that they were compiled in England by a certain John, abbot of St Martin's monastery and archchanter of the nearby Vatican basilica before 679. Andrieu proved that the oldest manuscript belongs to the eighth century. Moreover, he believed that the *ordines* were of Gallican origin and that the compiler had more enthusiasm for than knowledge of Roman customs. Others after him went further and branded the work as of no historical value³. In *Sacris Erudiri* of 1960⁴ I claim a Roman origin of these *ordines*, suggesting that they represent the urban rite of the mid-seventh century at the latest. They were written for Roman monasteries; St Peter's rather than the Lateran is the centre of the liturgy; *Missaæ publicæ* are more stressed than the stations; in the papal Mass there is no mention of a schola but only of chanters, etc. On the authority of Dom Ferrari, who defended the thesis that the Rule of St Benedict was hardly known in Rome before the tenth century, I admitted Gallican influence for details and quotations from that Rule. Dom Hallinger's study, appearing in 1960, showed not only how these references to St Benedict are no difficulty against a Roman origin of the collection but also that the whole complex of monastic practices is closely related to the *Regula Magistri* and early Roman monasticism. This established, one may hope, that the content of these *ordines* should be studied more closely to reveal the differences between the urban and later (?) papal rites. The origin of the one complete manuscript (St Gall) adds another

¹ See *Urban and Papal Rites*, 446 ff.

² Die römischen *Ordines* von Lorsch, Murbach und St Gallen, in *Universitas. Festschrift A. Stohr*, 1, Mainz 1960, 466 ff.

³ More serious observations on the list of authors in *Ordo XIX* are made by Coebergh, see pp. 176–188. I hesitate to agree with the suggestion that the compiler based his remarks upon the *Liber pontificalis* alone. There would have been more variation and shading in the monotonous description of each author's activity. Pope Damasus' liturgical activity was better known than just from the *Liber pontificalis*; see K. Gamber, *Codices liturgici Latini antiquiores*, in *Spicilegium Friburgensis subsidia I*, Fribourg (Sw) 1963, 81, no. 436.

⁴ *Urban and Papal Rites*, 450 ff.

fascinating aspect to the pre-Carolingian propaganda for the urban rite north of the Alps¹.

Reference has already been made to the dispute between the papal schola and Frankish chanters during the reign of Charlemagne. My contribution to this subject had to be short. Someone should now return to all the records of the missions of papal chanters to the North and to the earlier connections of northern churches and monasteries with Rome in connection with liturgy and chant. Early in this century they drew much attention, but in the light of recent developments they should be studied anew. For one thing, a good deal of the confusion expressed by Notker the Stammerer and Amalar finds an answer in the conspiracy among the papal chanters who wished to undo the reform².

Byzantinism

To the avant-garde of today's liturgical movement Byzantinism is a nasty word. Everything it stands for must go. The days of awe-inspiring pomp and splendour, they say, are over. Modern man is no longer inspired by awe, nor by rigorous and detailed ceremonial. Nor does he wish to be involved with the mysterious. Looking and listening alone bring him boredom rather than spiritual uplift. Instead he must act, speak and participate.

One might object that modern man can sit for hours in tense absorption before a television set without feeling, for one moment, the urge to participate; that he is losing a sense of mystery because his Christian mind is going; that he is out of touch with hieratic liturgy because he is too much impressed by those prosaic business reports. One might say that there is much good in what they call Byzantinism and much wrong with modern man and his liturgical movement. But one thing is obvious from this dispute. While practical liturgists have made up their minds about Byzantinism, historians are just discovering that western public worship contains much that was consciously adopted from Byzantium. It is another instance of that unfortunate phenomenon that historical study is consistently falling behind the urgent requirements of pastoral liturgy and reform. Much of the past and the present could be clarified, if scholars would dedicate

¹ See Gregory the Great, 236f.

² Papal schola, 26f., 29.

themselves to discover what exactly is eastern in the Roman liturgy and why this is so. For it is also an important aspect of the hypothesis on the urban and papal rites and anything to do with Rome.

Gregory the Great was accused of having introduced Byzantine customs into the liturgy; he denied it vigorously¹. Yet, it would be quite erroneous to ignore the strong influence the East had upon Roman customs before the mid-seventh century. The hypothesis does not do so. It suggests, however, that the papal rite developed from the urban rite as a deliberate imitation of the imperial court ceremonial. How can one justify this assumption?

Large-scale Byzantine influence is generally accepted for the *Ordo Romanus I*. The pope functions as the western vicar of Christ in the same manner as the emperor did in the East. The numerous court officials, laymen and clerics, the organisation of the schola with four leaders, graduate chanters and boys, all brought into the drama around the pontiff, some Greek terminology, the acclamations and many other details are obviously copied from the imperial East. A most striking instance is the ruling that, on the penalty of excommunication, the *quartus* of the schola, the actual leader of the choir (*archiparaphonista* = *archicantor*), was not allowed to change the solo-chanters or readers, once their names had been announced to the pope just before the introit². It reminds one of the heavy and rather cruel penalties inflicted upon those who, in the presence of the emperor, made a mistake or change in the court ceremonial. The *Ordo Romanus I* then provides us with a *terminus ante quem* from the last decades of the seventh century.

The papal Mass in the *Ordo Romanus XV* has little of this grandiose entourage of the pope. It is one of the reasons why I place its model at a much earlier date and regard it as the solemn ceremonial of the bishop of Rome rather than the expression of papal sovereignty from the heydays of the station liturgy. This *ordo* too has a few instances of Byzantinism. One is the practice of baptism on the Epiphany, several times rejected by earlier popes but quite common in the East and in Western countries.

¹ E. Wellesz, Gregory the Great's Letter on the Alleluia, in *Annales musicologiques* 2, 1954, 4ff.

² Text quoted in Gregory the Great, 218, note.

The latest discovery is by E. J. Jerg¹. He singled out the *sustentatio*, the act of supporting the pope when he goes from one place to another, as a ceremony derived from the imperial court.

Even so, there is no comparison between the episcopal simplicity of *Ordo XV* and the papal pomp of *Ordo I*. Something important, a fundamental change in the political outlook of the papacy must have taken place. Something that had direct consequences upon the manner in which the papacy presented itself to the world, a political change that, in medieval terms, could and should be equally expressed in the liturgy.

Vitalian's long pontificate (657–672) is not very detailed in the sources. Nevertheless, we know that he was the first pontiff to make his peace with the emperor. The latter visited Rome where he was received with all the splendour due to his position. And when shortly afterwards he was murdered in Sicily, his son would not have succeeded him without Vitalian's support. Vitalian therefore is the one pope who could have allowed and promoted a *pénétration pacifique* of Byzantium into Rome. His relationship with the emperor was such that the latter would have permitted the pope to adopt such symbols as made him his equal. The pope on his part could afford to use them for his own purpose. In fact, the whole background history of the period 657–730 provides the correct climate for a policy of give and take between the ecclesiastical and imperial powers of East and West.

For centuries nothing is heard about liturgical activities of Vitalian. Then, suddenly, from the later middle ages papal chanters are recorded as being or having been called *Vitaliani*². Jammers, Smits van Waesberghe and myself take this as indicating that the papal schola was founded by this pontiff. – In fact, the first record of the papal schola goes back to the reign of Vitalian's successor. – I, moreover, suggest that this happened on the basis of the existing Lateran branch of the urban institution, founded by Gregory the Great. The purpose of the new body was the performance of specifically papal chant, Gregorian. This is not a mere inference. Martin Polonus (13th cent.) mentions Vitalian in connection with *organum*; Radulph of Tongres (14th

¹ Die 'sustentatio' in der römischen Liturgie vor dem Hintergrund des kaiserlichen Hofzeremoniells, in Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie 80, 1958, 316ff.

² For this and subsequent details see Urban and Papal Rites, 468; Jammers, op. cit., 180ff.; Hucke, Zu einigen Problemen, 408.

cent.), who studied Roman liturgy at Rome, quotes Vitalian in one breath with Gregory I for interference with chant and *harmonia*. Some early medieval authors also refer to chant with such terms as *organizare*, etc.

Jammers offers a fascinating argument in favour of the idea that all these texts are relics of a tradition that Gregorian chant was the western equivalent of the imperial court music, where *ison* singing (*diaphonia basilike*) and the organ were imperial prerogatives¹. The enthusiasm of the Carolingians for this instrument may be another instance of their policy to build a western empire, a new Rome, that could rival Byzantium.

In this manner everything seems to fall into place. But the real evidence is much too scanty. It is true that the hypothesis does not require the assumption that papal liturgy was propagated throughout the West together with a diaphonic Gregorian chant. Even as a monody, it still was a striking symbol of unity with the *Ecclesia Romana*, while diaphonic performance remained a prerogative of the pope's court. To the Carolingian mind this symbol was just as effective as, for instance, the new Rome Charlemagne built at Aix-la-Chapelle, although the real proportions were far inferior to either the old Rome or Byzantium. But in order to make the hypothesis into a thesis, one should like to see more concrete Carolingian evidence on matters liturgical. — The same holds for the papacy. Typical of the seventh century is the *littera curialis*² of the papal chancery, which is now recognised as a combination of the Roman minuscule of the episcopal chancery of Ravenna and the imperial one of Byzantium. But again, a thesis on Byzantinism in papal worship requires many more data. The evolution of that so-called Golden Age may have been the opposite of what is ideal today. In most of the *ordines Romani* of that period the congregation may have been no more than onlookers and listeners. But where did it all begin? And when did it break through? — As for Byzantium itself, the evidence so far is really too late to justify reading history backwards; if ever this is justified! But early Byzantine literature on public worship is something both the East and the West are waiting for.

¹ Op. cit., 180ff.

² P. Rabikouskas, Die römische Kuriale in der päpstlichen Kanzlei, in *Miscellanea pontificia ed. a facultate historiae Ecclesiae in pontif. universitate Gregoriana 20*, no. 59 of the series, Rome 1958.

Addenda

p. 300, lines 23 ff. – From a summary in the *Sint Gregorius Blad* 83, 1962, 24f., of a lecture given by Smits van Waesberghe at the abbey of Berne, Heeswijk, Holland, in January 1962, it appears that the speaker had abandoned his hypothesis in favour of that defended in *The Urban and Papal Rites*, loc. cit.

p. 308, lines 4 ff. – A most important contribution is being made by R.-J. Hesbert, *Corpus antiphonalium officii*, of which so far 2 volumes have appeared: vol. 1, *Manuscripti "cursus Romanus"*, vol. 2, *Manuscripti "cursus monasticus"*, in *Rerum ecclesiasticarum documenta, fontes vii, viii*, Rome 1963, 1965.

p. 309, lines 12 ff. from bottom. – The unexpected death of Prof. F. Brenn at the end of 1963 has delayed this publication indefinitely. On the subject of Old-Roman and Gregorian chants see his: *Römisch-Gregorianisch (Ein kurzer Vergleich)*, in *Kathol. Kirchenmusik* 4, 1962, 3–12.

p. 311, bottom. – On the present paper Dom P. Meyvaert wrote to me from Quarr Abbey, on 12. Feb. 1964: “As regards confusion between Gregory I and II, I can confirm that it occurs in the MSS, for I remember that when I was hunting for copies of Gregory I's *Libellus responsorum*, I noticed that decrees of Gregory II often were listed as those of St Gregory. For a similar instance of confusion (or so it seems) you should read through O. Chadwick's paper “Gregory of Tours and Gregory the Great” in *The Journal of Theological Studies* 50, 1949, 38–49. . . . An allusion to this would deserve to be included somewhere in your paper as I think it provides corroborative evidence. On the term *iunior* for Gregory II see also the text published by Dom [L.] Machielsen in *Revue bénédictine* 73, 1963, 38, line 12...”

VIII. ASCETICA ET MONASTICA

A. M. ALLCHIN

L. BIELER

N. CORNEANU

I. H. DALMAIS

J. C. GUY

MARGUERITE HARL

J. KIRCHMEYER

W. P. LE SAINT

R. T. MEYER

A. MUNDÓ

F. X. MURPHY

R. T. OTTEN

FRANCE QUÉRÉ-JAULMES

A. SQUIRE

J. VANNESTE

The Appeal to Experience in the Triads of St. Gregory Palamas

A. M. ALLCHIN, Oxford

It is evident that in *The Defence of the Holy Hesychasts*, we have the primary theological work of the greatest theologian of the later Byzantine period. It goes without saying that in this work, in the course of his criticism of the writings of Barlaam, St. Gregory Palamas bases his own arguments firmly upon an appeal to the authority of the Fathers, and of the Holy Scriptures themselves. Nothing that is written here is meant to question the importance of that appeal to the Fathers, and to the Prophetic and Apostolic writers. But there is another element in his discussion, which because it takes a less prominent place could easily be overlooked. It is what we have called "the appeal to experience"; it is an element which ought not to be neglected, since it gives a particular character to the whole work in question.

In this paper we shall examine briefly some of the passages in the Triads in which the word *neīpa* is used, and shall try to assess their significance. The study is based on the critical edition of the work published in Louvain in 1959 by Dr. J. Meyendorff¹. Dr. Meyendorff has put us all in his debt by this work, and it is no derogation from the value of his edition to point out its minor deficiencies. The use of the word *neīpa*, for example, is noted only four times in the index of words having doctrinal significance. As we shall show there are at least as many cases again which would seem to warrant attention.

The controversy with Barlaam had, of course, originated in the latter's attacks on the practice of prayer as it was current in the monasteries of the day. The Triads have as their background, therefore, the sketes and hermitages of Mount Athos,

¹ Grégoire Palamas. *Défense des saints hésychastes*. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes, par Jean Meyendorff. Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense, Études et Documents. Fascicules 30 + 31.

and not the study of the professor, nor even the debating hall of the medieval university. Palamas is writing certainly as a theologian. But he is engaged in the defence of a way of life, and of a particular practice which is central to it. He appeals constantly to the Fathers. But for him there is no separation between Fathers and contemporary authorities. The experience which he defends and expounds theologically is one with which he is personally acquainted. This fact is made very clear in the interesting passage¹ where he traces down the line of witnesses to the practice of pure prayer through Symeon the New Theologian and Nicephorus, whom he describes as *τοὺς παλαιοὺς τῶν ἀγίων*, to those of his own day, who had themselves given their teaching about prayer orally. We should listen, he says, to such men as these, and not to those who have no experience of what they speak about, but who reason falsely and with many words; *μηδ' ἀπὸ πεῖρας, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ λογολεσχίας νονθετοῦντες*. We indeed, he says, have known some of these men of prayer personally, *αὐτοπροσώπως ὀμιλήσαμεν*. How can we be expected to turn from those who have learnt by experience and grace, *τοὺς καὶ πεῖρα καὶ χάριτι δεδιδαγμένους*, to those who wish to teach out of pride and love of disputation, *τοῖς ἀπὸ τύφου καὶ λογομαχίας ἐπὶ τὸ διδάσκειν χωρήσασιν?*

We can see in this passage a number of characteristics of Palamas' use of the word *πεῖρα*. First, his appeal is never overtly to his own experience, but always to what he has learnt from, or seen in, others. We may indeed conclude from the whole manner of his writing that he is no stranger to the things which he describes. But he does not say so explicitly. This fact has important consequences when we come to consider the second point in Palamas' attitude to experience. The word clearly implies a practical, as opposed to an abstract knowledge, an experienced understanding, as opposed to a purely verbal one. At the very beginning of the Triads, Palamas quotes a saying which seems to have been a favourite of his, *λόγω παλαίει πᾶς λόγος*, and contrasts purely logical arguments with knowledge gained by practice². Such knowledge involves almost by definition an inner, intensely personal element, what we should perhaps call the subjective, something which is incommunicable.

¹ Op. cit. I. 2.12. pp. 99–101.

² I. 1.1. p. 9.

But as Palamas makes clear it also involves a body of practical wisdom, which can be handed on and learnt by direct personal contact, and perhaps only in this way¹. Thirdly, and this also is most important, it is not merely a matter of technique, or of our own inner strivings. We learn by experience and grace, *πείρᾳ καὶ χάριτι*. It is the gift of God.

This experience of which Palamas speaks has, in his view, at its heart the direct, spiritual apprehension of God which is above human reasonings. Barlaam had argued precisely the reverse, that *τὰ πνευματικά* did not transcend human reason. The use of such an argument makes Palamas exclaim that it is evident that his opponent has no experience, *πεῖρα*, of the spiritual gift². If he had, he would not speak in this way of those things which neither eye hath seen, nor ear heard, neither have they entered into the heart of man³. And what is still worse, is that Barlaam shows no confidence in those who do speak from personal knowledge, *ἐκ πειρᾶς*⁴.

We are here, of course, at the central theme of the whole work, the experience in this life of the uncreated light and glory of the Age to come, the way in which God while remaining wholly transcendent, can yet in his humility give himself wholly to man. It is not our intention to speak here directly on this matter, but rather to follow out the problem which has already been stated, of how an essentially incommunicable experience, a knowledge above all words, can yet in some way be shared with and communicated to others. This is a question in itself of no small importance, for it concerns both the place and purpose of such an experience within the whole body of the Church. Palamas is quite clear that from one point of view, the experience is incommunicable. We can only know God, by knowing him. Just as we do not possess gold merely by thinking of it, but only by actually having it in our hands (the concreteness of the image is striking), so too we do not know God merely because the idea of God is frequently in our minds⁵. He quotes St. John

¹ Cf. the whole passage where he speaks of the handing on of the way of prayer, those with experience *τῇ πείρᾳ χείρᾳ διδόντων τοῖς εἰσαγομένοις*. II. 2. 1–2. pp. 319–321.

² II. 1.28. p. 279.

³ I Cor. 2. 9–10.

⁴ II. 1.29. p. 281.

⁵ I. 3.34. p. 185.

Climacus, ὁ τῇ πείρᾳ διδάσκων Ἰωάννης, to the effect that to try to explain the power of the divine illumination to one who has no experience of it, is like trying to explain the taste of honey to one who has never eaten it¹. But though the content of the experience may be incommunicable, yet its reality and something of its character is not. They can to some extent be taught and learnt. And so in a number of places, Palamas distinguishes between three classes of people, and not merely two. There are those who have seen, there are those who have confidence in them and in their testimony, there are those who disregard it. It is his particular reproach against Barlaam that he comes into the third category.

Palamas makes this point very vigorously in the section where he confronts the accusation of Messalianism which Barlaam brought against those who said they knew the things of which they spoke by experience, πείρᾳ². The fact that many saints have witnessed to this reality made no difference, and for Palamas this is enough to show ως ἐκ γεωμετρικοῦ πορίσματος, that Barlaam himself has received no experience at all of the divine mystery and of the power of the Holy Spirit, πεῖραν μνοτηρίου θεοῦ ή Πνεύματος ἀγῶνος ἐνεργεῖας. The fact that he regards Barlaam's rejection of the witness of the saints with such strong disapproval would suggest that Palamas held that there was an affinity between the experience of every Christian who had received some share of the heavenly gift, and that of the saint who had been led far on into the realm of divine vision, an affinity which allows the former to recognise in the latter, a much fuller growth of a life which is yet common to both. The condemnation of Barlaam lies precisely in his failure to make this recognition.

This is to be seen rather clearly in two of the passages in which the question of the deification of the body is discussed. In the first of these Palamas declares that the body as well as the soul, already in this life, shares in various ways in the consolation of the Spirit (those who have experience of it, οἱ ἐν πείρᾳ, know it)³, and this fact is evident also to those who come to see them, in their very appearance, and in their manner of life and conversation, full of the sweetness of God's grace, τὸ προσῆγες

¹I. 3.52. p. 223.

²III. 3.3. p. 699.

³I. 3.33. p. 183.

ἡθος, τὸ γλυκὺν δάκρυν, ἡ χαρίτων γέμουσα τοῖς προσιοῦσιν ἔντευξις. It is perhaps valuable here to compare the words of a Western monastic author writing two centuries earlier, who speaks in a similar way of those in whom “the inner light is reflected in their outward appearance . . . so that from the charm and simplicity of their expression and bearing there issues a sort of challenge to Thy love . . . when the Spirit helping their infirmity, their spirits pass to divine affections and their senses are controlled by a certain spiritual discipline, a certain spirituality appears in their very bodies, and their faces acquire an appearance that is more than human and have a singular and peculiar grace.”¹ If the doctrine of the body’s share in the life of grace has been less developed in the West than in the East, the reality to which it answers has not been unknown.

The second passage in which Palamas speaks of our subject in connection with deification comes in the third section of his work². Here again he reproaches Barlaam for touching this topic without practical knowledge of it. He quotes St. Basil to the effect that only he who has learned by experience knows the operations of the Spirit, *μόνος γὰρ ὁ πείρα μαθὼν οἶδε τὰς ἐνεργείας τοῦ Πνεύματος*³. But, he continues, if someone who seeks for this knowledge before he has done the necessary actions, has confidence in those who have experience, *τοῖς πεπειραμένοις μὲν πιστεύων*, then he will receive a certain image of the truth, *τι τῆς ἀληθείας ἴνδαλμα*. On the other hand if he tries to investigate and expound the matter in his own power, he will lose even this image of truth, and be filled with scorn for those who have experience, as if it were they who were in error, *καὶ πολὺς κατὰ τῶν πεπειραμένων ὡς πεπλανημένων πνεῖ*. Here too we can notice the contrast between those who have experience and those who do not, and again we have the counsel of confidence in their witness.

In all this we are able to see how for Palamas natural knowledge is not always a good, nor natural ignorance always an evil. Natural knowledge is of value only so long as it recognises

¹ William of St. Thierry. *Meditativae Orationes*, XII, PL 180, col. 217. English Translation: *The Meditations of William of St. Thierry*, By a Religious of C. S. M. V. London 1954 p. 95.

² Op. cit. III. 1.32. p. 619.

³ Meyendorff notes that the reference here is probably to St. John Chrysostom (*In Is.*, I, PG 61, col 14).

its partial character and maintains its respect for that other knowledge, which is above knowledge, that experience of God's fullness which only God can give. Taken apart from the wisdom that comes from the knowledge and love of God it can become a great evil. For Palamas this was a basic conviction, reinforced perhaps by that natural distrust for the workings of the intellect which is sometimes characteristic of the intellectual. At the same time, a man of his learning and ability could not fail to be aware of the value of reasoned argumentation; did he not make full use of his own powers in his defence of his hesychastic brethren? But his great intellectual gifts are all at the service of the simplest of his brethren, in whom he sees a wisdom gained by a following of the commandments and the practice of prayer, that is *by experience*, which far surpasses the intellectual agility of his opponent. We will give one last example of the way in which he appeals to his knowledge of their character and way of life. Barlaam had complained that the monks neglected to read the Scriptures because in certain stages of the growth in prayer, they were advised to set aside scripture reading for a time. Palamas replies indignantly that he knows from personal knowledge that this is not the case¹. He knew none among those who practice the prayer, τὰν μὲν ἐφ' ἡμῶν ἡσυχαζόντων οὐδένα ἔγνωμεν, who did not read the Scriptures, if he were able to read. As to those who are illiterate, one could take them for living books, βιβλοὺς ἀλλας ἐμφύχοντος, so much of the Scripture do they know by heart. It is these his illiterate brethren, the least learned, in the worldly sense, of the order of monks, with whom the Archbishop of Thessaloniki identifies himself, it is they whom he serves, their way of life he defends, for he believes with the apostle St. Paul that the foolishness of God is wiser than men, and the weakness of God is stronger than men².

¹ II. 1.11. p. 247.

² I Cor. 1. 25.

The Irish Penitentials: Their Religious and Social Background

L. BIELER, Dublin

Penitentials are manuals for confessors, setting forth tariffs of penance for a great number of specified sins. This *genre* of theological literature originated in the Celtic countries, possibly in Wales; the earliest full-scale specimens come from sixth-century Ireland; the tradition was continued in Anglo-Saxon England; it reached the Continent with the Irish and Anglo-Saxon *peregrini* and flourished in the Frankish kingdom and the German Empire throughout the ninth and tenth centuries.

The present paper is concerned with the Irish penitentials only. It is Ireland that gave shape to this particular type of penitential literature. The Anglo-Saxon penitentials are modelled closely on their Irish exemplars. The Continental penitentials combine Irish and Anglo-Saxon sources, and sometimes add other material of a canonistic or general spiritual nature; the so-called *Bigotianum*, for example, contains extracts from the '*Verba Seniorum*', the *apophthegmata* of the Desert Fathers¹.

These texts hardly deserve the name of literature in any specific meaning of the term. They are, however, of great value as source material for the ecclesiastical and legal historian and for the historian of civilization in general. These books came into existence in a decisive phase in the history of penance, and in a social milieu very different from the mediterranean civilization in which until then Christianity had developed. The Welsh and

¹ For a recent critical edition of these texts, with introduction, translation and commentary see L. Bieler — D. A. Binchy, *The Irish Penitentials*, Dublin, Institute for Advanced Studies 1963 (*Scriptores Latini Hiberniae*, vol. V). My English translations in this paper are taken from this publication (= B.). On the penitentials in general see the standard works by Wasserschleben, H. J. Schmitz, and McNeill-Gamer.

Irish Church, for which they were originally written, was then predominantly, if not entirely, a monastic church. The earliest penitentials were drawn up with a view to the needs of monastic communities and are concerned exclusively with the penance of monks. The monasteries, however, in Ireland more than elsewhere, functioned also as religious centres of the surrounding districts. They were often closely connected with the ruling family of a *tuath* or tribal kingdom, of which ancient Ireland had over a hundred. The king would grant the territory on which a monastery was to be erected; the founder often was a member of the royal family, and so, very frequently (as for example in Iona), were his successors. The monastic *familia* would cater for the spiritual needs of the lay people in whose territory the monastery was situated. One of the aspects of this state of things is the extension, in a modified form, of monastic penance to the laity. The transition is still quite visible in the Penitential of St. Columbanus, in which a nucleus of purely monastic application is followed by a section applying to both clergy and laity, and by another one which applies to lay people only. Of a similar though less obvious structure is already the earlier Penitential of Finnian.

The earliest documents that come under our terms of reference are probably the four short texts known as the Preface on Penance by Gildas, the Decrees of the Synod of North Britain, those of the Synod of the Grove of Victory, and Excerpts from a Book of David (i. e. St. Dewi of Menevia). They have been transmitted, in this order, in the twin manuscripts Cambrai 625 (late ninth century) and a codex Bigotianus, Paris Bibl. nat. lat. 3182 (tenth century). The ascriptions and historical associations of these canons depend entirely on the headings of these two manuscripts. Early Welsh origin is probable on internal evidence, but there is some reason for believing that they have passed through Irish hands. They certainly were drawn upon by the compilers of some Irish penitentials.

Undoubtedly Irish is the Penitential of Finnian, Latinized Vinnia(n)us, who was abbot of some Irish monastery. It is impossible either to date the work accurately or to identify its author. It must be earlier than the Penitential of Columbanus, of which it is the main source, and therefore almost certainly falls within the sixth century. Of the two famous Irish saints of

that period, Finnian of Clonard and Finnian of Moville, either is a possible candidate, but they are not the only ones.

Columbanus composed his Penitential in all probability on the Continent, that is, according to the more plausible chronology of his life, after 591. Its structure has been explained, and its substantial unity vindicated, by Dom Laporte¹.

More comprehensive as well as more systematic than these two works are two other penitentials: that of Cummean (i. e. Cummaine Fota, 'Cummian the Tall', whose death is recorded in the Annals of Ulster under 662) and the Old Irish Penitential, compiled at Tallaght (Co. Dublin) in the late eighth or early ninth century.

Earlier than any of these compilations is a document which is not a penitential but which includes a number of penitential canons, viz. the so-called *Synodus Prima S. Patricii*. J. B. Bury² was the first among modern historians to accept this set of canons as a substantially genuine record of the decrees of a synod presided over by Patrick and his fellow-bishops Auxilius and Iserinus. In my opinion, this view is still tenable even against the searching criticism of Dr. Binchy³. If the annalistic obits of fifth-century Irish bishops are reliable, this synod was held after the death of Secundinus (447), whose name is absent from the formula of greeting, and before the death of Auxilius (459).

A brief analysis of this document may serve as a convenient starting point for the following discussion. Its thirty-four canons, loosely grouped together, deal with divers problems such as might crop up in a nascent Christian community. Most of the canons are disciplinary, but only a minority can be termed penitential. The others merely state cases for excommunication or define its effects. In some instances the sentence of excommunication is conditional: 10. 'If anyone has made a good beginning as a psalmist, and then quits and lets his hair grow, he is to be excluded from the Church, *unless he returns to his former status*.' 16. 'A Christian who believes that there is such a thing in the world as a vampire . . . is to be anathematized — anyone who puts a living soul under such a reputation; and he must not be received again

¹ Le pénitentiel de saint Colomban, Tournai 1958.

² The Life of St. Patrick and his Place in History, 1905, pp. 233–245.

³ Studia Hibernica 2, 1962, 45–49; 168, note 422. Against this view see L. Bieler in: Mélanges offerts à Mlle Christine Mohrmann, Utrecht-Antwerp 1963, pp. 96–102.

into the Church before he has undone by his own word the crime he has committed, and so does penance with all diligence.' 17. 'A virgin who has made a vow to God to remain chaste and afterwards has taken a spouse in the flesh, shall be excommunicated until she changes her ways . . .'. 20. 'A Christian who, acting like a pagan, fails to pay a debt shall be excommunicated until he pays the debt.' This is the penitential tradition of Christian antiquity, applied to a new situation. Where penance is mentioned, as in two of the canons quoted and in a few others, it is hardly ever specified. The two instances where it is specified are interesting: 14. 'A Christian who has committed murder, or committed adultery, or sworn before a druid as pagans do, shall do a year's penance for each of these crimes; the year of penance completed, he shall present himself, accompanied by witnesses, and then be freed of his obligation by a priest.' 15. 'And he that commits theft shall do penance for half a year; twenty days on bread and water only; and, if possible, he shall restore the stolen goods; thus shall he be restored to the Church.' The three crimes which must be atoned for by a year's penance each are the three 'capital sins' of Patristic tradition. The duration of the penances, however, to go by the standards of the ancient Church, is remarkably short. I also draw attention to the detail that the reconciliation of the penitent is entrusted to a priest, and not to the bishop.

The penitentials properly so called testify to a penitential practice which contrasts in several respects with that of the ancient Church. The main points of difference are these:

1. The penances are graded not only according to the nature of the sin (including such distinctions as sins of desire and sins of action, or sins committed in private and sins committed in public), but also according to the status of the sinner.
2. The penance is enjoined not by the bishop or his official delegate, but by a confessor (*anmchara*, 'soul-friend') of the penitent's choice (*doctoris*, or *sapientis, iudicio*).
3. Most penances, though on the whole much longer and far more severe than those decreed by Patrick, are of a limited duration and therefore can be repeated. In other words, the sacrament of penance can be received more than once.
4. Long penances were often performed in monasteries. The penitent would, for the duration of his penance, attach himself

to a monastic community. Cummean (II. 5) even contemplates the case of a penitent who declares his intention of becoming a monk; in that event his formal penance might be shortened. A monk who had grievously sinned was often required to do penance 'in a foreign monastery' or 'under a foreign abbot', which I understand to mean 'in a monastery of a different *tuath*'.

As in the ancient Church, reconciliation (i. e. absolution) was deferred until the penance had been duly performed. However, Gildas (c. 1) and those who follow him decree that in the event of a long-term penance the penitent should be admitted to the Eucharist after eighteen months, 'lest his soul perish utterly from lacking so long a time the celestial medicine.'

Another difference between the ancient and the Welsh and Irish practice, and the one most commonly emphasized, is perhaps more apparent than real: the private character of the Celtic penance as against the public penance of antiquity. To be sure, penitents in Ireland had as such no particular status. Neither, to judge from our sources, did the penitent, as a rule, incur any permanent disqualification; even a sinner in holy orders would in many cases be allowed to resume his former rank and office after the completion of his penance. Many penances for minor offences could easily be performed in private, and the implication of numerous penitential canons is that they were so performed. Even St. Patrick's provision for witnesses in the case of one-year penances may be invoked as evidence of their private, or semi-private, nature. In the case of such grave sins as homicide or fornication, an element of publicity would inevitably be inherent in the sinner's excommunication, that is, in his exclusion from the Eucharist, and even from any active participation in the life of the community: *a mensa, missa, pace*, as a seventh-century canon summarizes. But we have seen that a deserving penitent might be admitted to the altar long before his term of penance was over.

The penitential system underlying the Irish penitentials has a double ancestry. One of its roots is in monasticism, which came to Ireland in a rather archaic form. In the monastic communities frequent confession even of minor sins, and in particular of sinful thoughts, was practised as a form of devotion and as a means of ascetic progress. For Irish monasticism I quote the testimony of St. Columbanus, who, in an appendix to his Peni-

tential, where he deals with monastic discipline, has the following to say on this matter¹:

It is ordained that confessions be made carefully, especially of mental disturbances, before going to Mass, lest perhaps any should approach the altar unworthily, that is, if he does not have a clean heart. For it is better to wait until the heart is healed, and becomes a stranger to offence and envy, than rashly to approach the judgement of the throne. For Christ's throne is the altar, and His Body there with His Blood judges those who approach unworthily. Therefore, just as we must beware of mortal and fleshly sins before we communicate, so we must refrain and cleanse ourselves from interior vices and the sicknesses of the ailing soul, before the covenant of true peace and the bond of eternal salvation.

In a monastic milieu also originated the institution of a personal confessor as a chosen director of the spiritual life².

The other line of development is more difficult to trace. It is the slow process of adaptation which the ideal of Christian perfection would, in its practical realization, inevitably undergo with the gradual expansion of Christendom and the ever more complex interaction of the Church and the world. To study this process on every level – theoretical, official, pastoral, private – is a task which, as far as I am aware, still remains to be undertaken. With a gross over-simplification, one might say that the alternative, in its extreme form, was between delaying penance to the deathbed and mitigating it in such a way that it could be performed as often as necessary without affecting unduly the penitent's civic and social life.

Only for Roman and early Merovingian Gaul has this process been studied in detail³. Unwilling to mitigate the rigours of public penance, the Gallic bishops abandoned canonical penance almost entirely, except for rare cases of grave scandal, in favour of the *paenitentia in extremis* – on the understanding, however, that the repentant sinner gave proof of a sincere change of mind and heart, a *conuersio*, and prepared him- or herself for the ultimate reconciliation by a truly Christian life. The *conuersio* might take the form of a religious *professio* (which *eo ipso* dispensed of canonical penance); normally, however, it would mean an

¹ B. 30.

² The Indian parallels adduced by John T. McNeill, *Revue celtique* 40, 1923, 89 ff., interesting as they are for the comparative study of religions, do not seem to warrant the theory of a historical connection.

³ Cyril Vogel, *La discipline pénitentielle en Gaule des origines à la fin du VIIe siècle*, Paris 1952.

integral Christian life in the world, a sort of Third Order, preferably under a spiritual director. Although the acceptance of penitential status (*accipere paenitentiam*) was delayed until the end of life, when it was followed immediately by the reconciliation, to do penance (*agere paenitentiam*) was in the sinner's reach at any time. After an appropriate period he would be readmitted to sacramental communion. The distinction of *accipere paenitentiam* and *agere paenitentiam* was formulated by St. Avitus of Vienne; the praxis is best known from St. Caesarius of Arles. The latter might well have influenced the Irish practice.

Even within the area and period under consideration we notice a certain development. The penitentials of Vinnian and Columbanus are evidence of the change in the concept of penance from vindictive to remedial penance, which is so amply attested by the fifth-century spiritual writers of Gaul. Emphasis shifts from atonement for sin to the moral rehabilitation of the sinner. Characteristic of this attitude is the predominance of medical metaphors, and in particular the adoption of Cassian's principle *contraria contrariis curare* (which, in turn, has a long prehistory both pagan and Christian). A technical innovation is the classification of sins, in Cummean and in the Old Irish Penitential, again after Cassian, under the headings of the 'eight capital sins', which correspond largely to the 'seven capital sins' of our catechism¹.

A special feature of Irish penance is the principle of commutation (Irish *(arr(a)e, arra*, Latin *arreum*, 'price, substitute'). It means that for a long-term penance a shorter but harder one may be substituted. An Irish synod of the seventh century decrees²: 'More fitting for pardon is a short penance with weeping and lamentation and a garment of grief than a long and lax one with a lukewarm mind.' In the eighth century, if not earlier, such commutations were tabulated; we possess two such 'Tables of Commutations', one in Latin, the other in Old Irish. In their austerity they breathe the spirit of the Culdee movement. For example, one of the commutations for a year of ordinary penance is this: 'a black fast for three days without eating, drinking,

¹ *Cenodoxia* 'vainglory' and *tristitia* '(spiritual) despondency' have been omitted, 'envy' has been added.

² The so-called *Synodus II S. Patricii*, c. 3.

sleeping: one night spent in water, another naked on nettles, the third on nutshells.' Other mortifications recommended as substitutes are frequent scourging and cross-vigils (i. e. long hours spent in prayer while standing, or prostrate on the ground, with stretched-out arms). Such penitential rigours were apparently not practised even in Ireland outside some monastic communities.

To all appearances, the 'commutations' are a unique feature in the entire history of penance. Even in Ireland they have no parallel. Suggested parallels in Irish secular law¹ or in Leviticus² are far from convincing. It is a different question whether the detailed tariffs of the Irish penitentials were, in a more general sense, inspired either by the native Irish or the Mosaic law. Neither possibility can be dismissed out of hand. That there existed in Ireland a school of thought which held that the Mosaic law was binding on Christians is evident from such compilations as the *Liber ex lege Moysi* or the so-called *Canones Adamnani*. In the same direction point some decrees of the seventh-century synod which has been referred to above. Here, however, we encounter already a tendency to compromise. The law of the jubilee year, for example, which provides for the returning of all property to its original owner at the end of a fifty years' cycle, is restricted to uncertain or obsolete titles, and it is recommended, as a safeguard against this obligation, to protect oneself by a title-deed³.

Some interaction of penitential and penal legislation would have been natural once the Church had attained to a definite status in Irish society. Legend has it that as early as the time of St. Patrick the traditional Brehon Laws were revised in a Christian spirit by a committee of bishops, kings, and lawyers, presided over by the Apostle of Ireland in person. This account is demonstrably unhistorical⁴. Synodus I S. Patricii, c. 21, expressly forbids Christians to bring their legal differences before a pagan court. Even at a later time, when Ireland had long become a Christian country, there existed at best a vague analogy between the concepts of penance for sin and composition for

¹ So John T. McNeill, *Revue celtique* 40, 1923, 329.

² The compensations for vows listed in Lev. XXVII were compared by Fournier, *Revue celtique* 30, 233.

³ Syn. II S. Patricii, c. 30.

⁴ See Binchy, l. c., p. 20f.

crime. The *Canones Hibernenses* (so termed by Wasserschleben) are several separate pieces of partly penitential, partly general ecclesiastical, and partly even purely secular legislation. Nevertheless, most of these are introduced as the decrees of a *synodus Hibernensis* or *synodus sapientium*.

Problems might arise in the case of acts which would involve penance as well as compensation according to secular law. Vinnian c. 9 prescribes that a layman who has struck down another person and has shed his blood without killing him shall not only perform the appropriate penance but also pay an adequate compensation. Columbanus (B 21) takes this over and adds the provision that, if the guilty person is too poor to pay according to the harm done, he shall call a physician at his expense and do the victim's work until the latter has recovered; only then may he commence his penance. A similar provision is made in the Penitential of Cummean, IV. 9–10. Less satisfactory is the attempted harmonization in the following case (Vinnian c. 23):

If any cleric commits murder and strikes down his neighbour and he is dead, he must become an exile from his country for ten years and do penance seven years in another city, three years of this time on an allowance of bread and water and salt, and for four years he shall abstain from wine and meat, and fast during the forty-day periods on an allowance of bread and water and salt; and having thus completed the ten years, if he has done well and is approved by testimonial of the abbot or priest to whom he was committed, he shall be received into his own country and make satisfaction to the friends of him whom he slew, and compensate his father and mother, if they are still in the flesh, by filial piety and obedience and say: 'Lo, I am in the place of your son; I will do for you whatever you tell me.' But if he does not fulfil his obligation he shall not be received back for ever.

The murderer has to submit to a long penance involving exile, but according to Irish law he has also to take upon himself those obligations which a son would normally have towards his parents – obligations about which the native law texts are very specific. The two demands are not easy to combine. Ten years after the murder was committed the victim's parents might no longer be alive. Columbanus must have felt this difficulty, for he 'amends' Vinnian as follows (B 13):

Whoever has committed murder, that is, has killed his neighbour, let him do penance three years on bread and water as an unarmed exile, and after three years let him return to his own, rendering the compensation of filial piety and duty to the relatives of the slain, and thus after making satisfaction let him be restored to communion at the discretion of the priest.

It should be noted that Columbanus makes the fulfilment of these duties a condition for the penitent's reconciliation, including it, as it were, in the actual penance.

These, as far as I am aware, are the only explicit references in Latin penitentials of Irish origin to secular legal obligations. The Old Irish Penitential goes much farther. In the case of sins which are also public crimes, such as theft or homicide, the legal fines and compensations are accepted as a substitute, wholly or in part, for penance. In certain cases, for example homicide committed by a priest or bishop, provision is even made for a co-operation of the civic and ecclesiastical authorities.

To what extent may the penitentials be used as sources of social history?

In the *Paenitentiale Bigotianum* there is a section on keening (IV, 6,2–5):

2. The penance for the wailing of a female defendant after the death of a layman or laywoman, fifty days on bread and water;
3. if (the dirge is sung) after (the death of) a servant woman who died in childbirth, or of him who cohabits with her, they being believers, forty days on bread and water;
4. if after (the death of) a cleric of the parish, twenty days on bread and water;
5. if after (the death of) an anchorite or a scribe or a bishop or a great prince or a great king, fifteen days on bread and water.

The penances are graded according to the status of the deceased person (the higher the rank the lesser the penance), which clearly is in the nature of a compromise. It is also interesting to observe that these canons contemplate the singing of a dirge for persons in holy orders. Besides, there seems to have been a school of thought which justified formal mourning on the grounds of biblical precedent (*ibidem*, 7):

Jakob the son of Isaac was lamented for forty days in Egypt and for a whole week in the land of Canaan; and so was Christ in the New (Testament), the women wept for Him; and it is found written in the Canon with almost innumerable examples of the Scriptures, and for whom no lament is made to him it is reckoned as bad merit.

All this sounds authentic enough. So do the references in several of our texts to love potions and to various means, tinged with magic, of procuring abortion.

I am not so sure about references to certain forms of sexual perversion. Taking these provisions at their face-value, one would have to conclude that such sins as incest or sodomy were

rampant in early Irish society. This is not to deny categorically that such things ever happened. On the other hand, I feel sure that the frequency of these references with their detailed specifications of obscene acts bear little if any relation to reality. A great deal of all this would seem to owe its existence to a desire for material completeness and a delight in subtle distinctions and classifications, which is a notorious weakness of the legal mind. Occasionally, we do come across an unequivocal factual statement like this (*Table of Commutations*, c. 8): 'There is hardly a single layman or laywoman who has not some part in manslaughter.' Such instances, however, are extremely rare.

The few examples which I have quoted represent each a different category of evidence. They have been taken from a wide field which is still largely unexplored but which, in my opinion, is well worth exploring.

Contributions des traducteurs roumains à la diffusion de «l'Échelle» de saint Jean Climaque

N. CORNEANU, Timișoara

Les écrits des Saints Pères de l'Église sont bien connus et grandement estimés chez les orthodoxes roumains. La spiritualité patristique leur est devenue depuis longtemps familière, en leur déterminant et leur modelant le style de vie chrétienne. L'intimité établie entre eux et la pensée des Pères n'est pas la conséquence uniquement de l'instruction reçue de la part de l'Église, sous son toit, et par tous les moyens à sa disposition, mais aussi d'une peine méritoire de populariser l'ancienne littérature chrétienne dans les cercles les plus larges des membres de l'Église orthodoxe roumaine. Et cela, par transcription et impression, par traduction et interprétation. Non seulement les membres du clergé, ce qui est tout naturel, mais aussi les simples fidèles, se sont approchés, dès les temps les plus anciens, avec piété de la littérature patristique, en y puisant de la sagesse et des élans pour une véritable vie en Christ.

Ainsi se fait que les œuvres des Saints Pères connaissent une grande diffusion dans le milieu roumain. Il n'existe pas un auteur, à notre connaissance, auquel il ne lui fût consacré une monographie, pas un écrit, qui ne fût traduit ou au moins commenté. Il y a des Pères auxquels on a accordé une attention spéciale, surtout à cause du caractère éducatif et pratique de leurs œuvres. Citons, du nombre de ceux-ci, St. Jean Chrysostome, Basile le Grand, Ephrem et Isaac les Syriens, Jean Climaque, Théodore le Stoudite, etc . . . ainsi que les auteurs anonymes des «Prés», «Apophthegmes des Pères» ou «Vies des Saints». Néanmoins, il paraît que le plus aimé de tous fut Saint Jean, le supérieur de Mont Sinaï, dont l'œuvre «l'Échelle» a connu une circulation tout à fait étonnante.

Quoique destinée aux moines, elle comprend des règles utiles pour tous ceux qui désirent atteindre à la perfection, en leur indiquant minutieusement la voie à parcourir afin de se spiri-

tualiser. Et n'est-ce pas justement cet objectif que poursuit chaque chrétien? C'est pourquoi il n'y a rien d'étonnant que «l'Échelle» ait joui d'une si large popularité.

Dans ce qui suit, nous voulons montrer comment elle s'est répandue parmi les fidèles orthodoxes roumains, en recourant aux témoignages que nous offre l'histoire. Cette incursion nous offrira une preuve éloquente de la préférence témoignée dans le passé à une merveilleuse œuvre patristique et sera pour ceux d'aujourd'hui une raison de continuer à lui accorder la même estime point amoindrie.

Tout comme les autres écrits spirituels, «l'Échelle du Paradis» a été lue tant dans l'Église, dans le cadre du culte divin, qu'en dehors d'elle. Dans le premier cas, elle a été connue spécialement par les moines, et évidemment non seulement par eux, grâce aux lectures qui se faisaient pendant les offices sacrés, notamment ceux de la période du «Triode», lorsqu'un des dimanches — le 4-ème — est consacré à St. Jean Climaque. L'on sait, par exemple, que dans les monastères du Mont Athos, au moment même où commence le grand Carême de Pâques, commence aussi la lecture de «l'Échelle»¹. C'est pourquoi dans les «Triodes» utilisés là-bas, sont parsemés des fragments de «l'Échelle»². La même chose s'est passée dans les monastères roumains, où, soit au culte public officié dans l'Église, soit à l'occasion des repas communs, soit enfin pendant les prières particulières, en dehors de ce qui était propre à chaque circonstance, on faisait des lectures prolongées des écrits des Saints Pères, parmi lesquels Saint Jean Climaque. A ces lectures on a accordé une importance si grande, que leur texte a été, avec le temps, détaché et inclus dans des collections à part, nommées «prologues»³. Des fragments de «l'Échelle» se rencontrent ici en abondance.

Mais la préférence pour «l'Échelle» est allée jusque là, qu'elle était considérée comme un écrit indépendant et était placée dans l'Église pour être lue. C'est ce qui résulte, par exemple, d'une note du moine Etienne de Tismana, écrite sur «l'Échelle»

¹ Heinrich Brockhaus, *Die Kunst in den Athos-Klöstern*², Leipzig 1924, pp. 82–83, 86.

² Idem, op. cit., p. 194, note 1.

³ Cf. A. Pertusi, *Les prologues dans l'historiographie byzantine (IV-e—XII-e siècles). Essai sur la mentalité byzantine dans l'histoire. Actes du X-e Congrès Internationale d'Etudes Byzantines, Istanbul, 1957*, p. 243 sq.

apportée par lui en 1815, du couvent bien connu de Neamțu, en Moldavie: «... Ce livre sacré, qui s'appelle l'Échelle de Saint Jean Climaque, fut acheté par moi l'humble, afin de l'avoir pour lecture tant que je vivrai, et après ma mort, qu'il reste au saint monastère de Tismana ... afin qu'il soit dans l'église des pères pour lecture, et à moi et à ceux qui m'ont engendré pour éternelle mémoire. Amen.»¹

«L'Échelle» est sortie bientôt des églises et des monastères pour entrer dans les maisons des clercs et des fidèles, tant dans la version originale grecque, copiée par d'habiles calligraphes, que dans d'extrêmement nombreuses versions en slavon et non moins en roumain. Les anciens manuscrits slavons du milieu du XV-ème siècle environ, quelques-uns composés avec un art particulier, présentent une importance remarquable².

Evêques et moines, princes et hauts dignitaires, citadins et villageois, hommes et femmes, tous ont lu insatiabillement les «degrés» montant vers le ciel de la «Lestvitza» (de l'Échelle). Ainsi, par exemple, le prince Néagoé Bassarab, – au nom duquel est liée la construction du célèbre monastère de Curtea de Argeș, au début du XVI-ème siècle – dans les conseils qu'il donne à son fils Théodore, s'en réfère à quelques reprises consécutivement à Jean Climaque³.

Des familles chrétiennes, d'autre part, gardaient dans leur maison «l'Échelle» à côté de la Bible. Nous connaissons ainsi un manuscrit, conservé dans la Bibliothèque de l'Académie de la R. P. R., sous le no. 494, qui est demeuré pendant quelques générations au sein de la même famille⁴.

C'est cette application du roumain orthodoxe à la lecture de «l'Échelle» qui en exigea de bonne heure la traduction. A partir

¹ D. Alexandru, Jeromonahul Ștefan Tismăneanul și tîrnosirea bisericii Sf. Nicolae de la Cernica (L'hieromoine Etienne et la consécration de l'église Saint Nicolas du monastère Cernica), dans la revue Mitropolia Olteniei, Craiova, an. 9, No. 1–2, janvier-février, 1957, 78–81.

² A. J. Iațimirski, Славянски и Русския рукописи Румынскихъ библиотек St. Peterburg, 1905, pp. 184–197, 442–445, 566, 727 et P. P. Panaiteescu, Les manuscrits slaves de la bibliothèque de l'Académie de la République Populaire Roumaine, vol. I, Bucarest, 1959, pp. 83, 85, 87, 178–179, 240–243, 390–394.

³ Vasile Grecu, Invățăturile lui Neagoe Basarab (Les préceptes écrits par Néagoé Bassarab), version grecque, éditée et traduite, Bucarest, 1942, pp. 38–39, 196–197.

⁴ Ion Bianu – R. Caracăs, Catalogul manuscriselor românești (Le catalogue des manuscrits roumains), vol. II, Bucarest, 1913, pp. 26–27.

du XVI-ème siècle, paraissent de nombreuses versions roumaines, qui à leur tour sont copiées et plus tard imprimées.

Les traductions roumaines de «l'Échelle» ont à la base, une partie d'entre elles l'original grec, d'autres – les plus nombreuses – différentes versions slavones. Comment ont paru ces traductions au cours du temps et quel en fut le sort ?

Il faut le dire dès le commencement, l'esprit «philocalique», qui a pénétré l'être des orthodoxes roumains, n'est pas étranger au courant hesychaste, qui a atteint son apogée au XVI-ème siècle, grâce au labeur de ses protagonistes, Grégoire Palamas (1296–1359) et Grégoire le Sinaïte (1255–1346). Le dernier surtout, «imbu des préceptes de l'Échelle», puisqu'il provenait du monastère de Sinai, où «des traditions de Saint Jean Climaque restaient vivantes»¹, se fixant en Bulgarie a répandu la spiritualité hesychaste dans les pays de langue slave. Ses adhérents vont alimenter avec abondance le goût pour les écrits philocaliques, dont le plus estimé était justement «l'Échelle», et, en même temps, vont contribuer à leur intense propagation. L'impulsion donnée par les disciples slaves de Grégoire le Sinaïte explique la pénétration sur le territoire de la Roumanie d'extrêmement nombreuses versions slaves de «l'Échelle», lesquelles, en premier lieu, se trouveront à la base des premières traductions autochtones. C'est pourquoi c'est avec celles-ci que nous allons commencer.

A. Traductions de l'Échelle faites sur des versions slaves

1. La plus ancienne traduction roumaine de «l'Échelle» appartient au renommé métropolite moldave Varlaam, de la première moitié du XVII-ème siècle, lequel – ce n'est pas sans intérêt de le mentionner – fut sur le point de devenir patriarche de Constantinople, vu le prestige dont il jouissait. En utilisant une version slave, comprenant d'évidentes expressions ukrainiennes, le prélat roumain la traduit en roumain. Avec cette traduction commence-t-il non seulement son œuvre spirituelle², mais aussi «la suite

¹ Jean Meyendorff, St. Grégoire Palamas et la mystique orthodoxe, Col. Maîtres spirituels 20, Bourges 1959, p. 67.

² Pr. T. Bodogae, Mitropolitul Varlaam ca teolog (Le métropolite Varlaam comme théologien), dans la revue Mitropolia Moldovei și Sucevei, Jassy, an. 33, No. 10–12, octobre-décembre, 1957, 778.

des traductions en langue roumaine d'un très grand nombre de livres religieux, qui remplissent le XVII-ème siècle et une partie du XVIII-ème, en contribuant ainsi au développement de la langue littéraire roumaine»¹.

«L'Échelle» a occupé une place importante dans la vie du métropolite Varlaam. On peut même affirmer, à juste raison, qu'il existe un rapport entre la traduction de «L'Échelle», commencée dans la jeunesse, étant moine (1618) et sa vie en continuelle ascension vers les sommets de la spiritualité et aussi de l'hierarchie ecclésiastique². En s'appliquant à la traduction de la «Lestvitza», il se montre un bon connaisseur du slavon et, au même degré, un érudit théologien, car «il n'est pas facile de saisir le sens de la phrase de Jean le Sinaïte pour celui qui ne possède pas une culture théologique speciale»³.

Tout ce qu'il continuera d'écrire, durant son activité, se trouvera d'une certaine manière, sous le signe de cette peine initiale. Le souffle ascétique et la compétence avec laquelle il discute les problèmes de spiritualité et aussi la manière dont il résout grand nombre des thèmes proposés dans ses «Cazanii» – (Commentaires des Evangiles) – qui constituent son chef-d'œuvre, semblent être influencés par «L'Échelle». Les parallèles sont plus que concluants⁴.

En traduisant, Varlaam recourt à un précédent intéressant, bien que naturel pour ce temps-là: il met dans une colonne le texte slavon, et dans une autre le texte roumain. C'est ainsi qu'on peut suivre de près et la version dont il est parti, et la manière dont il a accompli la charge de traducteur. On peut remarquer de la sorte qu'il n'a pas strictement suivi le texte – qu'il a d'ailleurs développé par de très nombreuses gloses explicatives, – mais il a donné une traduction littéraire et nous a offert une rédaction originale. En considérant l'obscurité du texte de «L'Échelle», nous nous rendons bien compte que la réalisation du prélat moldave représente une œuvre hardie, qui n'aurait pu être entreprise par n'importe qui. C'est pourquoi il a fallu s'écou-

¹ St. Ciobanu, *Istoria literaturii române vechi* (L'Histoire de l'ancienne littérature roumaine), vol. I, Bucarest, 1947, p. 260.

² T. Bodogae, o. c. p. 775.

³ Gh. Ghibănescu, *O nouă lucrare a mitropolitului Varlaam: Lestvița lui Joan Scărarul* (Une nouvelle œuvre du métropolite Varlaam; *Lestvitza du Jean Climaque*), dans: *Arhiva. Organul societății științifice și literare din Iași*, an. 25 (jubilaire), nr. 3–4, 1914, 76.

⁴ T. Bodogae, o. c. p. 779.

ler un certain temps jusqu'à ce que d'autres essaient de faire une nouvelle traduction, ceux qui désiraient d'en connaître le contenu se contentant de copier celle-ci¹.

La traduction de Varlaam, malheureusement, n'a pas été imprimée. Néanmoins, elle a connu une très grande circulation, étant copiée plusieurs fois, trois siècles durant, en entier ou seulement quelques «degrés», par le même calligraphe ou par plusieurs, en gardant la forme originale, ou en introduisant des modifications, soit dans l'orthographe et le lexique – ce qui était tout naturel, vu l'évolution de la langue – soit dans la présentation même de la traduction, en renonçant à la colonne avec le texte slavon, à mesure que la langue du peuple fut introduite dans l'Eglise. Grand nombre de ces copies se trouvent dans la bibliothèque de l'Académie Roumaine, Section des Manuscrits. D'entre elles, nous mentionnons, en gardant leur chronologie autant que possible, les suivantes:

1. a) No. 2983, miscellanea du XVII-ème siècle, qui reproduit incomplètement la version de Varlaam;
- b) No. 493, écrit pour le monastère moldave Probota du vivant de Varlaam;
- c) No. 494, écrit par l'hiéromoine Gennadios «avec tous ses frais» en 1699, avec l'orthographe en quelque sorte modernisée, environ 70 ans plus tard;
- d) No. 2511 et 2512, écrits par Vlad le Copiste dans les années 1693 et 1694 pour l'hiéromoine Ilarion, supérieur du monastère, Bistritz, Olténia, devenu évêque de Rîmnicul Vilcea;
- e) No. 2650, écrit par Josèphe, le supérieur du monastère Olténien Hurezu vers 1740 d'après l'exemplaire copié par Vlad le Copiste;
- f) No. 2665, rédigé vers 1725 dans le monastère Hurezu en Valachie, par le supérieur Josèphe;
- g) No. 2952, écrit par le moine Mélété du monastère moldave Rîșca entre 1797 et 1798;
- h) No. 1724, écrit dans le monastère Neamtzu pour la communauté du renommé supérieur Païssy Vélickovskij.

2. Une autre série de traductions est due à l'impulsion donnée par Païssy – qui vient d'être cité – (1722–1794). Pendant qu'il

¹ Gh. Ghibănescu, loc. cit.

était supérieur de Dragomirna et ensuite de Sécou et Neamțu, tous les trois des monastères roumains de Moldavie, le renommé Paissy lisait pour lui et pour la communauté entière les règles de celui dont l'esprit continuait d'exister entre les murs des monastères orthodoxes de partout. «Quand l'hiver arrivait», nous raconte un de ses biographes, «tous les frères se rassemblaient venant des charges du dehors, dans le couvent, surtout pendant le carême de Noël; alors le supérieur, en utilisant les livres de règles, commençait à tenir conseil avec les frères. Cela durait du commencement du carême de Noël jusqu'au samedi de Lazare. Chaque jour, excepté les dimanches et les jours de fête, les frères se réunissaient le soir dans la trapéza, on allumait des cierges, le supérieur arrivait et s'asseyant à sa place habituelle, lisait ou le livre de Saint Basile le Grand, ou le livre de Saint Jean Climaque, ou celui de St. Dorothéos, ou de St. Théodore le Stoudite, ou de St. Siméon le Nouveau Théologien, ou bien celui d'un autre des Pères Théophores... Après avoir lu un morceau du livre, aussitôt le supérieur expliquait ce qu'il venait de lire, en citant à l'appui des passages de la *Sainte Ecriture* et des livres des Saints Pères...»¹

D'ailleurs, Paissy a obligé tous les moines des monastères, dirigés par lui, de lire, en même temps que «l'Échelle», les écrits d'autres Saints Pères. C'est ce qui résulte du «Règlement», c'est-à-dire le Statut de la vie monachale, établi par lui, point VI-ème². Et puisqu'il y avait des moines qui ne connaissaient pas la langue grecque, et d'autres ni même le slavon, il a traduit ou bien il a fait traduire «l'Échelle» en entier, ou seulement des parties d'elle³.

La Bibliothèque du monastère Neamțu possède ainsi de nombreux manuscrits «moldaves» ce qui veut dire roumains, comprenant «l'Échelle» ou bien des «degrés» d'elle. Dans un «Registre pour les livres moldaves d'abord, et pour les livres grecs, qui se trouvent dans la bibliothèque du Saint monastère

¹ Sergheie Cetfericov, Paisie – starețul mănăstirii Neamțu din Moldova (Paissy – le supérieur du monastère Neamțu en Moldavie), traduction en roumain par le patriarche Nicodème, ed. 2-a, Neamțu, 1943, p. 200.

² Le Manuscrit no. 1494 f. 15 v. de la Bibliothèque de l'Académie R. P. R.

³ И. Хибарин, Литературно-переводческая деятельность старца Паисия (Величковского), Журнал Московской патриархии 1956, No. 12, 58–62 (I. Hibarin, Le travail de traducteur du supérieur Paissy Velitchkovsky, dans: Journal du Patriarcat de Moscou).

Neamțu» – rédigé entre 1800 et 1825, se trouvant dans cette bibliothèque même, sous le No. 110 f. 13 v. – sont indiqués les «livres moldaves» suivants:

«1 ms.: Jean Climaque. Texte écrit par Pafnuce le Maître; 8 mss.: Jean Climaque, 4 discours pour l'obéissance, par «plusieurs plumes»; 1 ms.: Jean Climaque, 4 discours pour l'obéissance; 1 ms.: «pareil»; 1 ms.: Jean Climaque, 4 discours, 56 feuillets»¹.

Quelques-uns de ces manuscrits sont perdus ou bien sont détériorés à force d'être utilisés, de sorte que nous ne les avons plus à la disposition pour les consulter. Cependant nous pouvons dire qu'un assez grand nombre sinon la majorité d'entre eux avaient à la base la version slave. Ainsi un des manuscrits qui est encore conservé, et qui se trouve à Neamțu, Section des manuscrits, No. 41, et qui comprend le 24-ème degré de «l'Échelle», «pour la douceur et pour la simplicité et la non-méchanceté, et pour la méchanceté, volontairement acquises et non de par la nature», représente une traduction du slavon et appartient à un disciple du réputé supérieur. Le manuscrit, selon toutes les apparences, date du XVIII-ème siècle².

Cependant la communauté du supérieur Païssy a utilisé, aussi, comme nous l'avons dit, «l'Échelle» dans la traduction de Varlaam, déjà existante en la faisant multiplier par transcription. Une preuve nous est fournie par le manuscrit No. 1724, de la bibliothèque de l'Académie R. P. R., qui contient les quatre premières «stepene» ou degrés.

3. A partir de la seconde moitié du XVIII-ème siècle, on essaie de faire de nouvelles traductions de «l'Échelle». La langue dans laquelle elles sont écrites est plus pure et plus claire et le soin de garder l'exactitude du texte est plus grand. D'ailleurs le texte même dont on part, n'est plus toujours l'ancien, mais un autre, modernisé et semblable en partie à la langue russe d'aujourd'hui.

a) Nous citons, en premier lieu, la traduction de l'archimandrite Barthélémy Mazareanu, du monastère moldave de Putna, un

¹ Pr. D. Fecioru, Un catalog de manuscrise și cărți ale bibliotecii mănăstirii Neamțului (Un catalogue contenant des manuscrits et livres appartenant à la Bibliothèque du monastère Neamțu), revue Biserica Ortodoxă Română, Bucarest, an. 59, 1941, No. 7–8, juillet-août 1941, 423, 434.

² Pr. D. Fecioru, Manuscrisele de la Neamț. Traduceri din Sfinții Părinți și din scrierile bisericești (Les manuscrits du monastère Neamțu. Traductions des Saints Pères et écrivains ecclésiastiques), revue Studii Teologice, Bucarest, Série II, No. 7–8, septembre-octobre 1952, 460, 461, 466.

érudit remarquable, qui a popularisé assidûment l'écrit philocalique. Sa traduction datant de l'année 1766, est contenue dans le manuscrit No. 2959, de la bibliothèque de l'Académie R. P. R. Dans la préface, l'auteur tient à préciser que la version travaillée par lui est destinée à être «pour le profit spirituel des pères religieux et de tous les chrétiens orthodoxes» (f. 1).

En parlant de la traduction de l'archimandrite Barthélémy Mazareanu, un commentateur faisait remarquer que par elle fut réalisé ce qu'on avait accompli «en russe, où le texte paléoslavon avait été modernisé au XVIII-ème siècle, donnant une langue ecclésiastique plus proche de la langue d'aujourd'hui que de celle des anciens textes slavons»¹.

b) Une autre version roumaine, ayant à la base le texte slavon, est celle contenue dans un manuscrit du XVIII-ème siècle, gardé dans la Bibliothèque du Patriarcat Roumain, sous le No. 5, et provenant du monastère Caldarușani, près de Bucarest. Cette traduction, suivant son modèle est différente comme structure de l'original grec. Ainsi, pour donner un exemple, dans «le discours» ou «de degré» XVI-ème, sont inclus les «discours» XVI-ème et XVII-ème.

Le manuscrit fut destiné au culte, ce qui résulte du fait qu'après le titre, avant de commencer le texte de chaque «discours» se trouve intercalée l'invocation: «Bénissez mon Père»².

c) De la même époque, nous avons encore deux manuscrits, lesquels bien qu'ils soient sûrement des copies de certaines traductions faites sur un texte slavon; il reste à en préciser la filiation. Il s'agit en premier lieu, du manuscrit No. 163 de l'Académie R.P.R. dû à l'hieromonie Grégoire du monastère de Cozia et rédigé en 1765. Le deuxième de l'année 1796, c'est le ms. 3543, toujours dans la bibliothèque de l'Académie R.P.R., provenant du monastère Tziganesti, aux environs de Bucarest et qui contient seulement les degrés 4, 25 et 28. Ce qui est à remarquer au sujet de ce manuscrit, c'est qu'il fut écrit par une religieuse appelée Micdonia, qui demande à tous ceux qui le liront «de prier pour la pécheresse écrivain» (f. 210 v.). C'est l'unique manuscrit provenant d'une femme.

¹ Gh. Ghibănescu, o. c. 87.

² Pr. D. Fecioru, Catalogul manuscriselor din Biblioteca Patriarhiei române (Le catalogue des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque du Patriarcat Roumains), revue Studii Teologice, Bucarest, Série II, an. 11, No. 5-6, mai-juin 1959, 366-370.

d) On peut mentionner encore quelques autres manuscrits, comprenant la traduction de «l'Échelle», dont la filiation reste aussi à être identifiée:

ms. 2569, appartenant à la bibliothèque de l'Académie R.P.R. de l'année 1773, écrit par le moine Raphaël, du monastère Hurezi¹.

ms. 2315, appartenant à la bibliothèque de l'Académie R.P.R. de l'année 1779, écrit par un certain Basile Mihailovici, en Valachie².

ms. 3318, appartenant à la bibliothèque de l'Académie R.P.R. de l'année 1787, écrit par l'hiéromoine Dorothéos de Valachie³.

ms. 22, dans la bibliothèque du Patriarcat Roumain, miscellanea du début du XIX-ème siècle, ne comprenant que deux degrés⁴.

e) A partir du XIX-ème siècle, les traductions faites des versions slaves deviennent rares, leur place étant occupée par des traductions ayant à la base le texte grec original. Ce fait s'explique non seulement par le revirement hésychaste, déterminé par l'activité de Nicodème l'Hagiortite (1748–1809) l'auteur de la remarquable collection grecque appelée «Philocalie» (1782), mais aussi par le désir des lecteurs d'avoir à leur disposition des traductions faites directement d'après l'original, chose possible à être réalisée, grâce aux relations avec le monde grec et surtout avec le Mont Athos. Cependant, les connaisseurs de la langue russe – et ils étaient nombreux, vu les liens étroits entre les Églises Orthodoxes Roumaine et Russe – continueront de lire «l'Échelle» et de la traduire ou du moins de la résumer d'après sa version slavone. Jusqu'à ce jour de nombreuses traductions circulent, faites pour la plupart d'après l'édition de la communauté Optina-Cozelsc et imprimée dans la lavre St. Serge, mise sous la protection de la Sainte Trinité (aujourd'hui Zagorsk).

Le Métropolite Gurie Grosu plus tard, partant d'un texte russe, donne en 1930 un résumé, qu'il fit même imprimer⁵.

¹ G. Strempel, *Copiști de manuscrise românești pînă la 1800* (Copistes des manuscrits roumains jusqu'au 1800), vol. I, Bucarest 1959, p. 200.

² Idem, o. c. p. 153.

³ Idem, o. c. p. 56.

⁴ Pr. D. Fecioru, Catalogul mss. din Biblioteca Patriarhiei române, revue Studii Teologice, Bucarest, Série II, an. 12, No. 5–6, mai-juin 1960, 451 et 453.

⁵ Treptele „Scării” cuviosului Ioan Scăraru (Les degrés de l'Échelle du Saint Jean Climaque), traduits et abrégés par le métropolite Gurie, col. «Biblioteca creștinului dreptcredincios», No. 19, 1930, pp. 58.

B. Traductions de «l'Échelle» faites d'après l'original

Nous nous sommes occupés jusqu'ici des traductions de «l'Échelle», ayant à la base un texte slave. Il ne manque, ainsi que nous l'avons déjà anticipé, non plus les traductions faites directement de l'original grec.

1. La première connue est représentée par le manuscrit No. 3024, se trouvant dans la bibliothèque de l'Académie R.P.R. Cette traduction achevée dans l'année 1775, appartient à un moine anonyme, faite d'après la version néo-grecque d'Athanase de Crète, ainsi qu'il résulte du titre même.

2. Mais c'est l'érudit hiéromoine Macarios du monastère Cernica – près Bucarest – qui essaiera de donner une traduction de «l'Échelle» fidèle autant que possible. Sa traduction est accompagnée de scolies et prétend être «mot à mot sans aucune addition superflue ni éclaircissement de moi», capable pourtant, dans la mesure du possible, de rendre inaltérée la pensée de l'auteur. Pour rendre le texte plus exact, ainsi que pour enrichir les scolies, il a recours à la version néo-grecque de Maximos Margunios du 1590¹.

D'ailleurs, sa traduction elle-même fut précédée de la traduction des scolies dans l'année 1785².

Macarios acheva son «Échelle» en 1782 et, sans avoir pu la faire imprimer, il la copia lui-même à plusieurs reprises. La bibliothèque de l'Académie R.P.R. possède deux pareils manuscrits provenant de Macarios (Nos. 1905, 1913). Des copistes pour la multiplier apparurent ensuite en grand nombre, ainsi qu'il nous est attesté par le manuscrit No. 1901, toujours à l'Académie R.P.R. ou par le manuscrit No. 50 de la bibliothèque du Patriarcat Roumain³.

3. Une autre rédaction, toujours du grec, est celle qui est contenue dans le manuscrit No. 2324, de la bibliothèque de l'Académie R.P.R. Il est écrit par Georges le Maître (*Dascălul*)

¹ Cf. Emile Legrand – Louis Petit – Hubert Pernot, *Bibliographie hellénique des ouvrages publiés par des grecs au XVIII-ème siècle*, t. II, Paris, 1928, pp. 195–196.

² Preot D. Furtună, Ucenicii starețului Paisie în mănăstirile Cernica și Căldărușani (Les disciples du supérieur Paissey dans les monastères Cernica et Calderusani), Bucarest, 1928, pp. 66,16.

³ Pr. D. Fecrior, *Manuscrisele din Biblioteca Patriarhiei române*, revue Studii Teologice, Bucarest, Série II, an. 13, No. 9–10, novembre–décembre 1961, 603.

en 1786, pour le supérieur Dossithéos du monastère Campulung en Valachie. Pareil à celui-ci est le manuscrit No. 1391, se trouvant dans la bibliothèque de l'Académie R.P.R. *miscellanea*, qui contient des parties de «l'Échelle».

4. Ces versions faites d'après le texte grec se trouveront à la base de «l'Échelle» roumaine, que fera imprimer en 1814, dans l'imprimerie du monastère Neamțu, un autre renommé métropolite de Moldavie, Veniamin Costache. Il ne traduit pas, il ne fait qu'amender une traduction déjà existente, en la corrigeant. «Les traductions anciennes d'après le slavon – constate dans la préface le prélat éditeur – sont faites dans une langue impropre, qui à présent est tout à fait inutilisée». Pour cette raison «maintenant, de la langue grecque, dans laquelle son auteur l'avait écrite (l'Échelle), elle fut traduite dans la nouvelle langue roumaine, très minutieusement, avec beaucoup de soin, et en consultant patiemment grand nombre de versions grecques».

La version éditée par Veniamin Costache se présente ainsi comme la plus soigneusement travaillée, en respectant toutes les exigences scientifiques, lesquelles, pour ce temps-là, il faut le faire remarquer, constituent un trait particulièrement positif. Ainsi, furent consultés des manuscrits grecs, apportés du Mont Athos, une édition grecque-latine, probablement celle de Matthaeus Raderus (1638), laquelle se trouve rééditée dans la collection Migne, comme aussi certaines versions néo-grecques, celle, par exemple, de Jérémie le Sinaïte, parue à Venise en 1774¹. Quand aux sources consultées, elles n'ont pas été utilisées d'une manière servile, mais continuellement comparées, pour pouvoir adopter la meilleure leçon, ainsi qu'il est précisé dans la même préface, citée plus haut: «Dans le livre imprimé grec-latin, se trouvant grand nombre de fautes, omissions et discordances, dans beaucoup d'endroits, on a tâché de les corriger, de les compléter et de les accorder, au moyen de mots et de scolies, puisés dans les deux autres manuscrits grecs, utilisés, pour la traduction, en même temps que le livre imprimé; manuscrits qui furent trouvés meilleurs dans beaucoup d'endroits et identiques l'un avec l'autre».

Un mérite particulier de la version de Veniamin Costache consiste dans l'effort d'expliquer le texte de «l'Échelle», parfois très difficile, au moyen de scolies, puisées surtout dans les manu-

¹ Cf. E. Legrand – L. Petit – H. Pernot, o. c. pp. 195–196.

scrits grec consultés. Par rapport aux scolies contenues dans l'édition grecque-latine, réimprimée dans la collection Migne, par exemple, les scolies de Veniamin Costache sont plus nombreuses et plus explicites.

Ainsi conçue et rédigée, «l'Échelle» de 1814 représente une réalisation appréciable, un événement caractéristique au «siècle d'or» de l'ancienne littérature roumaine – tel qu'il est nommé le XIX-ème siècle – «durant lequel la langue roumaine s'est enrichie avec de nombreuses saintes écritures, bienfaisantes pour l'âme et instructives pour tout le peuple»¹.

Néanmoins, la version dont nous nous occupons, a, elle aussi, beaucoup de défauts, inhérents à l'époque où elle a paru. Celui d'entre eux qui, dès le premier abord, attire notre attention à nous, lecteurs d'aujourd'hui, c'est l'obscurité de nombreux passages, conséquence du respect vis-à-vis de l'original allant jusqu'à garder même la suite des phrases.

Quand même, elle eut une circulation inépuisée, même aujourd'hui, étant conservée avec beaucoup de considération, lue avec piété et même copiée². Vers 1819, donc quelques années après avoir été imprimée, un assidu lecteur de livres ecclésiastiques a introduit dans son «sbornic» – gardé dans la bibliothèque de l'Académie R.P.R., sous le No. 3536 – des parties de «l'Échelle» de Veniamin Costache, parmi lesquelles la 18-ème marche en entier, y compris les scolies.

5. Une autre traduction faite d'après l'original grec peut-être, vers la fin du XVIII-ème siècle, appartient à l'un des plus assidus traducteurs roumains de l'ancienne littérature chrétienne. Il s'agit de Samuel Micu Clain (1745–1806). Celui-ci nous a laissé 27 titres de traductions des Saints Pères, comprenant environ 7.500 pages de manuscrits, quelques-uns transcrits 2 ou 3 fois.³ Il a accordé une attention spéciale aux Pères grecs⁴, aux écrits philocaliques et en particulier à «l'Échelle»⁵, dont non seulement

¹ N. Iorga, *Istoria literaturii române în secolul al XVII^{lea}* (Histoire de la littérature roumaine du XVIII-ème siècle), vol. II, Bucarest, 1901, pp. 397–404.

² Dionisie I. Udișteanu, *Graiul evlaviei străbune* (La voix de l'ancienne piété), vol. I, Monastère Cernica, 1939, pp. 58–59.

³ Prof. Dr. N. Mladin – Pr. I. Vlad – Prof. Dr. Al. Moisiu, Samuil Micu Clain teologul (S. M. Clain le théologien), Sibiu, 1957, p. 50.

⁴ Cf. Ioan Georgescu, *Sfintul Augustin în literatura română* (Saint Augustin dans la littérature roumaine), revue *Observatorul*, Beiuș, an. 3, No. 4–6/1940, 228.

⁵ N. Mladin – I. Vlad – Al. Moisiu, o. c. 51.

il cite des passages dans ses sermons¹, mais aussi il en traduit à plusieurs reprises. Ainsi, en 1803, pendant qu'il se trouvait à Blaj, il a traduit, sur 381 feuillets, «Enseignements ascétiques de nos saints et pieux Pères: Pacôme, Ephrem le Syrien, Jean Climaque, Abba Isaïe, Abba Amon, Théodore le Stoudite et Abba Maxim»². L'auteur tient à mentionner – à tort bien entendu – que les écrits des Saints Pères, traduits par lui, «sont maintenant pour la première fois traduits en roumain, par le père Samoil Clain, de Sad, hiéromoine du monastère de la Sainte Trinité, de Blaj»³.

Ce manuscrit *miscellanea* contient la traduction d'une des dégrées de «l'Échelle» et il est fort probable que Samuel Clain ait traduit encore d'autres degrés⁴. Ce qui est certain, c'est qu'il a traduit en langue roumaine «Le discours au pasteur», la partie finale de «l'Échelle», toujours pendant qu'il se trouvait dans le monastère de la Sainte Trinité de Blaj. C'est ainsi que la bibliothèque de Blaj, Section des manuscrits, sous le No. 96, feuillets 160–169, possède «Le discours au pasteur, de notre Père, parmi les Saints, Jean Climaque», c'est-à-dire celui qui a écrit «l'Échelle»⁵ traduction que certains historiens littéraires ont considéré, à tort, perdue⁶.

6. Avec ces traductions on pourrait finir la liste des versions roumaines de «l'Échelle», les plus importantes, faites d'après l'original grec. Cependant, plus tard aussi, il y a eu d'assez nombreux admirateurs de l'œuvre du Saint Abba du Mont Sinaï, qui se sont appliqués à le rendre en roumain, en traduisant «l'Échelle», entièrement, ou seulement des fragments d'elle. Nous citons le dernier d'entre eux. Il s'agit de l'hiéromoine

¹ Idem, o. c. 72.

² Dr. Jacob Radu, *Manuscrisele bibliotecii Episcopiei greco-catolice române din Oradea Mare. Studiu bibliografic* (Les manuscrits de la bibliothèque de l'évêché greco-catholique d'Oradea Mare. Etude bibliographique), Bucarest, 1923, p. 11.

³ Pr. Prof. Gh. Moisescu, *Samuil Micu Clain, 150 ani de la moartea sa* (S. M. Clain, 150 années de sa mort), revue *Biserica Ortodoxă Română*, Bucarest, an. 74, No. 10–11, octobre-novembre 1956, 1074 et la note 96.

⁴ I. Bianu, *Viața și activitatea lui Samuil Micu* (Vie et activité de Samuil Micu), Bucarest, 1876.

⁵ Prof. Nicolae Comşa, *Manuscrisele românești din Biblioteca centrală de la Blaj* (Les manuscrits roumains de la bibliothèque centrale de Blaj), Blaj, 1944, p. 103.

⁶ George Pascu, *Istoria literaturii române din secolul XVIII* (Histoire de la littérature roumaine du XVIII^e siècle), vol. III, Iassy, 1927, p. 114–115.

Ioasaf Popa, qui a fait imprimer presque intégralement «le discours au pasteur», la dernière partie de «l'Échelle»¹.

Ce que nous avons montré jusqu'ici, peut nous offrir une image, ne fût-ce qu'incomplète, de la large diffusion connue par l'œuvre de St. Jean Climaque, parmi les orthodoxes roumains. A partir du XV-ème siècle, sur le territoire de l'actuelle République Populaire Roumaine, commencèrent à circuler grand nombre de manuscrits grecs et slaves, contenant «l'Échelle», et à partir du XVII-ème siècle, aussi des traductions de celle-ci, lesquelles furent lues partout avec ferveur, copiées et gardées. A côté des autres écrits des Saints Pères qui allaient au cœur des orthodoxes roumains, «l'Échelle» contribua ainsi à leur spiritualisation et favorisa la création d'un climat de vie chrétienne authentique.

Le zèle des fidèles roumains en vue de connaître et de suivre les merveilleux préceptes de «l'Échelle», et non moins ceux des autres écrits de la même famille, ne s'est jamais amoindri. Les nombreux manuscrits et ouvrages imprimés, contenant l'œuvre du supérieur du Mont Sinaï, attestent jusqu'à l'évidence ce fait. A l'exception des russes, dans la langue desquels parurent la plupart des traductions des Saint Pères², c'est dans le champ spirituel des roumains que la semence des écrits philocaliques a donné plus de fruits.

Siècle après siècle, «l'Échelle» fut traduite, comme nous l'avons montré, soit d'après le slave, soit d'après le grec, l'histoire de sa propagation constituant l'histoire même d'une vie réellement chrétienne. Les notes marginales, mises sur les exemplaires de «l'Échelle» par les traducteurs, les copistes, les lecteurs, ou par de simples possesseurs, ne laissent aucun doute en ce qui concerne la place spéciale tenue par «l'Échelle» dans leur vie. Donnons dans ce sens un seul exemple, pris au hasard d'ailleurs, et peut être pas le plus éloquent. Le manuscrit No. 493 de la bibliothèque de l'Académie R.P.R., contenant une copie de la traduction du métropolite Varlaam, porte sur la face intérieure de la couverture en bois, la note suivante: «Ce livre qui s'appelle Jean Climaque, je l'ai lu, moi l'humble moine Théodore de Moldavitz et beaucoup de consolation j'ai trouvé en lui. Je vous prie, frères, de ne pas abîmer ce livre, parce que Dieu nous juge. 1783, juin, 15».

¹ Revue Glasul Bisericii, Bucarest, an. 17, No. 3, mars 1958, 227–228.

² J. Meyendorff, o. c. p. 152.

Le même moine lit encore une fois «l'Échelle», après 7 mois seulement, et note de nouveau, en slavon et en roumain: «Fevr. 15, 1784, je l'ai encore lu et une plus grande consolation pour mon âme j'y ai trouvé».

Un simple moine, par conséquent, relit «l'Échelle» dans l'année 1783, après l'avoir lu auparavant on ne sait pas combien de fois, pour que, après une demi-année seulement, il la parcoure encore une fois, tenant à préciser que cette chose lui avait procuré beaucoup de profit spirituel. Une telle piété et un pareil zèle philocalique sont vraiment touchants. Et combien d'autres ne furent-ils ressemblants à celui qui vient d'être nommé.

Nourriture spirituelle et guide dans la voie ascendante vers la perfection «l'Échelle» fut continuellement estimée par les orthodoxes roumains à un degré qu'il n'est pas sans intérêt de mettre en évidence, ainsi qu'il résulte, pensons-nous, de ce qui a été dit jusqu'ici.

L'héritage évagrien dans la synthèse de saint Maxime le Confesseur

I. H. DALMAIS O. P., Paris

Posée depuis plus de trente ans la question des relations entre S. Maxime et Evagre le Pontique est sans doute encore loin d'avoir dégagé toutes ses implications. Une connaissance plus approfondie de l'œuvre et de la pensée d'Evagre, de ses relations avec Origène et avec l'Origénisme postérieur suscite des perspectives nouvelles.

Dans deux articles qui firent date et auxquels il faudra toujours se reporter (RAM Avril-Juillet 1930), le P. M. Viller établissait, sur la base, assurément restreinte mais à ses yeux décisive, des *Quatre Centuries sur la charité*, la dépendance de Maxime par rapport à Evagre, non seulement pour le vocabulaire ou les classifications des éléments de la vie spirituelle, mais pour l'ensemble du système selon lesquels ils s'ordonnent. Sa conclusion est formelle: «C'est essentiellement la même doctrine qui persévere, avec de nombreuses additions sans doute, avec des précisions et des corrections, chez le grand saint du VII siècle. Personne ne s'étonnera de voir Maxime prendre tout son système à un autre: la propriété littéraire n'était pas en ces temps-là aussi déterminée qu'aujourd'hui. Maxime nous apparaît dès lors comme un érudit qui a recueilli partout ce qu'il donne comme ses idées propres: il a laissé de côté ce qui lui semblait erroné» (p. 259).

N'y a-t-il vraiment en Maxime d'autre originalité qu'un discernement, singulièrement avisé il faut au moins le reconnaître, entre l'héritage le plus authentique de la tradition monastique transmis au travers des écrits d'Evagre et les gauchissements que celui-ci leur aurait fait subir en les intégrant à son propre système? Il est difficile de le prétendre sans négliger la partie la plus considérable des ouvrages spirituels de Maxime, bien des pages des *Qu. ad Th.* et surtout la quasi totalité des *Ambigua*, ces commentaires souvent diffus et obscurs, mais si riches de

doctrine sur des passages difficiles de S. Grégoire le Théologien et Denys l'Aréopagite. C'est ce que devait bientôt rappeler le P. Urs von Balthasar dans un ouvrage fascinant *Kosmische Liturgie*¹. La place faite à Evagre parmi les maîtres de Maxime n'est certes pas amoindrie. Bien au contraire ; ce n'est pas seulement comme théoricien de la vie spirituelle et de ses cheminement, mais surtout par les aspects les plus spéculatifs de sa pensée que le Pontique a exercé son influence sur l'ancien moine de Chrysopolis. Mais, par delà Evagre, Maxime est entré en contact direct avec Origène et cette fréquentation du maître Alexandrin, non seulement au travers du *De Principiis*, mais de préférence dans ses commentaires et homélies scripturaires est venue nuancer en bien des points les rigides systématisations d'Evagre. Et puis, bien d'autres influences ont joué ; celle des écrits aréopagitiques, celle des Cappadociens. Enfin et surtout Maxime s'est trouvé providentiellement amené par la défense de l'orthodoxie chalcédonienne à faire du Christ, Dieu et homme en une seule personne, la clé de voûte de sa propre synthèse. Car la pensée de Maxime est profondément originale. Si les courants les plus divers de la pensée chrétienne grecque viennent confluer en lui, s'il puise aux traditions philosophiques les plus variées, ce n'est pas en compilateur érudit. Cet héritage multiforme, il se l'est parfaitemt assmilé.

Ce plaidoyer éloquent a généralement reçu un chaleureux accueil. Grâce à lui le nom de Maxime et quelques aspects de sa pensée ont dépassé le cadre restreint des familiers de la théologie byzantine. Et cependant, dans la préface à une nouvelle édition de son ouvrage, le P. Urs von Balthasar déclarait avec quelque mélancolie que les affirmations massives du P. Viller continuaient à avoir cours, au moins pour ce qui est de la doctrine spirituelle du Confesseur ; elle constituerait un simple démarquage des enseignements d'Evagre en la matière. Or une enquête plus large et plus attentive, par delà le vocabulaire et les définitions, aux nuances de la pensée et à l'équilibre des divers éléments mis en jeu, oblige — le P. Sherwood entre autres devait en fournir de nombreux exemples — à reconnaître que Maxime demeure toujours attentif à ne pas laisser sa propre doctrine spirituelle se couler dans les schèmes évagiens. L'orientation fondamentale n'est-elle pas radicalement différente ? Essentiellement intellectu-

¹ 2^e Ed., Einsiedeln 1962.

aliste chez Evagre, elle s'ordonne pour Maxime dans une rectification du vouloir en sorte que le sommet de la vie spirituelle n'est plus dans une parfaite transparence de l'intellect contemplatif à la lumière divine en laquelle il devient lui-même lumineux, mais en une identification aimante du vouloir humain à la volonté divine, en sorte que se réalise entre eux cet échange qui a nom charité. Même dans les *Quatre Centuries*, l'ouvrage de Maxime où l'influence et l'imitation d'Evagre se font le plus directement sentir, c'est la charité qui fournit le fil directeur et donne leur signification aux sentences proposées à la méditation du spirituel. Dans la préface et les notes de la traduction anglaise, qu'il en a naguère donné, Dom P. Sherwood a bien montré comment l'influence évagrienne est beaucoup plus nuancée qu'il ne pourrait apparaître au premier abord. Même dans ce recueil, par delà Evagre, Maxime semble bien faire appel à des traditions spirituelles profondément différentes de celles que livrent les écrits du Pontique. Il est bien impossible de leur appliquer ce que le P. Hausherr, bon connisseur s'il en est des textes évagiens, écrivait à propos du plus authentiquement traditionnel d'entre eux, les 153 chapitres *Sur la prière*: «La mystique évagrienne reste plus philosophique que théologique, au moins au sens trinitaire»¹, entendant par là qu'Evagre n'a jamais intégré dans sa mystique la théologie trinitaire.

Mais c'est sans doute dans les *Ambigua* que cette divergence se manifeste le plus clairement et elle y prend une ampleur qui met en jeu l'ensemble de la systématisation évagrienne comme un tout dont il est impossible d'extraire certains éléments sans leur faire subir des transformations profondes. Il nous apparaît que ce recueil, traduit en latin ne l'oubliions pas par Scot Erugène, est l'ouvrage fondamental qu'il faut scruter pour comprendre la pensée de S. Maxime et discerner l'intention de son œuvre. Il faut souhaiter voir se multiplier des études comme celles de Dom Sherwood qui s'appliquent à l'exégèse des moindres détails de ces textes difficiles.

Or, en ce qui regarde Evagre, cette interprétation nous paraît devoir être renouvelée par les perspectives ouvertes par la découverte en sa teneur originale, au travers d'une version syriaque, de l'ouvrage le plus considérable d'Evagre, celui dans lequel

¹ Les leçons d'un contemplatif. La traité de l'oraison d'Evagre le Pontique, Paris 1960, 98.

il livre les orientations profondes de sa pensée : les *Cinq Centuries gnostiques*. M. A. Guillaumont, à qui nous devons cette importante découverte en avait ici même, en 1959, indiqué les conséquences pour l'étude de l'origénisme du VI^e siècle. La thèse dans laquelle il a récemment développé ces premières intuitions nous offre une reconstitution du système évagrien qui nous paraît singulièrement éclairante pour l'interprétation de l'œuvre de Maxime dans son ensemble et dans les orientations qui l'ont pour une large part suscité¹. Il est regrettable qu'en donnant une nouvelle édition de l'étude qu'il avait voici une vingtaine d'années consacrée aux deux *Centuries* de Maxime sur la *Théologie et l'Economie*, le P. Urs von Balthasar n'ait pas cru devoir la reprendre en fonction de cette découverte. Le jeu des thèmes évagiens et origéniens qu'il avait décelé tout au travers de ces chapitres dénommés par lui *Centuries gnostiques* se trouverait sans doute éclairé par la référence au texte originel des *Centuries d'Evagre*, texte dont M. Guillaumont a montré qu'il était connu de Maxime qui l'a cité au moins deux fois². M. Guillaumont lui-même, dans le bref passage qu'il consacre à Maxime parmi les témoins de l'influence persistante d'Evagre dans les milieux de langue grecque, a brièvement posé dans une note la question de l'étendue de cette influence. Après avoir renvoyé aux articles du P. Viller et à la traduction française du P. Pégon pour les *Centuries sur la charité*, il ajoute : « Il est juste de faire remarquer, comme l'a fait M. U. von Balthasar (Lit. cosmique, 1947, p. 28–34), que les *Centuries sur la charité* sont l'ouvrage le moins personnel de Maxime et que celui-ci a su constituer un système profondément originel. Mais dans ce système, l'origénisme, spécialement l'origénisme évagrien est entré comme un élément essentiel, qui est encore à définir exactement » (p. 164).

Or il nous semble que l'exposé du système évagrien qui nous est ici proposé permet de marquer quelques lignes de recherches, mais surtout qu'elle interdit de maintenir une dissociation pure et simple entre les éléments spéculatifs du système évagrien et son enseignement ascétique. Celui-ci n'est il pas en fin de compte ordonné à cette contemplation gnostique dont les *Centuries* nous

¹ A. Guillaumont, *Les Kephalaia gnostica d'Evagre le Pontique et l'histoire de l'origénisme chez les Grecs et chez les Syriens*, *Patristica Sorbonensis* 5, Paris 1962.

² Cent. II 78 et V 11, citées dans les Scholies sur la Hiérarchie Ecclésiastique de Denys, PG IV 173 ab.

proposent certains thèmes ? Et sans doute, pris en eux-mêmes les préceptes de l'*Asceticos* et même la corbeille de poissons du *Traité de la prière* transmis sous le nom de S. Nil ont pu être mis impunément à profit par des générations de moines. Mais peuvent-ils se suffire à eux-mêmes ? Certains esprits à tout le moins ne seront-ils pas incités à spéculer sur l'origine et les déterminants de cette condition de passions et d'ignorance à laquelle l'ascèse s'offre de porter remède ? Et aussi sur l'état vers lequel elle conduit ? En une page remarquable d'équilibre et de nuances, A. Guillaumont a rendu justice aux moines «origéniens» des Scété, et à leurs successeurs : «Pour les uns, les plus nombreux, le moine devait se consacrer uniquement aux labeurs de la vie ascétique, lutter contre les tentations, pratiquer les vertus, garder la solitude, pleurer sur ses péchés et n'avoir d'autres pensées que celle de la mort et du jugement ; aussi avaient-ils de la méfiance pour toutes les formes de la curiosité de l'esprit, notamment vis à vis de l'Écriture. Les autres, tout aussi fervents dans l'ascèse, pensaient que celle-ci, loin d'être une fin en elle-même, donnait accès à une activité nouvelle de l'esprit et que la vie spirituelle se continuait normalement dans la recherche des sens cachés de l'Écriture et dans l'examen des mystères relatifs aux «êtres» et à Dieu : bref, en langage évagrien, que le moine ne doit pas être seulement un «pratique», mais un «gnostique» (p. 160). Mais nous ne croyons pas pouvoir le suivre lorsqu'il ajoute : «La condamnation de 553 mit fin à cette lignée de moines hautement intellectuels dont Evagre était le représentant le plus éminent» (p. 160). Une telle famille d'esprits trouvera toujours des représentants et une condamnation ne saurait la faire disparaître. Mais il est évident que les anathématismes de 553, comme bien d'autres dans la suite des âges, ont dû provoquer dans certaines âmes monastiques des crises douloureuses. Nous en avons peu de confidences dans le demi-siècle qui suivit ; sans doute Maxime dut-il, dès les premiers temps de sa vie monastique, s'entendre questionner par des compagnons qui n'ignoraient pas la réputation de philosophe qu'il s'était acquise dans le siècle. Un certain nombre de ses brèves réponses nous ont vraisemblablement été conservées, mêlées à des éléments inauthentiques, dans diverses collections que la tradition des copistes a fait passer sous son nom et qui n'ont guère jusqu'ici retenu l'attention de ses interprètes. Mais surtout nous avons dans le recueil des réponses à Thalassius un remarquable exemple de ce que peut

être une interprétation gnostique de l'Ecriture, profondément cohérente avec les données les plus authentiquement traditionnelles de l'ascèse monastique. Les *Ambigua* relèvent de la même préoccupation. On sait par Barsanuphe (PG 86, 897) et par Cyrille de Scythopolis (Vie de Cyriaque, éd. Schwartz, p. 99, 25–27) comment les moines origénistes des laures palestiniennes mettaient leurs spéculations aventureuses sous le couvert de S. Grégoire de Nazianze. Les textes qui fournissent matière aux dissertations de Maxime peuvent constituer un florilège de ces références compromettantes. Dom P. Sherwood et A. von Ivanka ont eu parfaitement raison de chercher dans les explications de Maxime une réfutation de l'origénisme condamné en 553. Mais, sachant désormais que la doctrine contenue dans les anathématismes est très exactement celle des *Centuries* évagiennes en leur teneur originelle, c'est d'abord en référence à cette doctrine qu'il convient d'interpréter les explications de Maxime. Il est remarquable que les questions étudiées de la manière la plus approfondie touchent précisément aux points les plus caractéristiques de l'enseignement évagrien et notamment à la doctrine du «mouvement» qui fondait tant sa cosmologie que son eschatologie. Dom P. Sherwood a longuement établi comment Maxime touche à la racine de l'origénisme condamné par Justinien en substituant à la séquence origéniste *στάσις, κίνησις, γένεσις* la triade *γένεσις, κίνησις, στάσις* qui met en pleine évidence le dynamisme essentiel de la créature en son jaillissement originel et en son ordination profonde à Dieu en qui seul elle peut trouver son repos et sa consistance. Prudemment il réserve la question de savoir si, au moment où il composait les *Ambigua* Maxime avait déjà une connaissance directe de l'œuvre d'Origène. Osons dire que cette question est ici secondaire. En fait, au travers de l'origénisme des anathématismes, c'est proprement Evagre qui est visé. Et il l'est d'autant plus vigoureusement que sa Christologie intellectualiste ouvrira le champ à une gnose qui évacue ce qui est l'essentiel du christianisme: le salut ouvert aux hommes déchus par la Passion et la mort du Christ, Verbe incarné. Ici la rectification s'impose à un double plan. Pour Evagre, le Christ est un intellect, une nature raisonnable, distinct de tous les autres uniquement par le fait que lui seul est resté uni à l'Unité (Cent. I. 77): «Le Christ n'est pas connaturel de la Trinité, car il n'est pas non plus science essentielle, mais seul il a en lui toujours la science essentielle inséparablement. Mais le Christ, je

veux dire Celui qui est venu avec le Verbe de Dieu et en esprit est le Seigneur, est inséparable de son corps et par l'union est connaturel de son Père, parce qu'il est aussi science essentielle» (VI, 14). Maxime s'oppose résolument à cette dichotomie entre le Christ et le Verbe. La ferme doctrine de Chalcédoine lui permet d'assumer tout ce qui peut l'être de l'*Hénade* origénienne et de la manière dont les créatures se trouvent en dehors d'elle. Cette *Hénade* est le *Logos* divin pour autant qu'il porte en lui les *logoi* de toutes les créatures. Et le Christ est ce Logos lui-même, assumant la condition de créature en son humanité afin de la restituer à sa condition originelle, de rénover la nature comme dit Maxime en une formule énergique qu'il se plaît à répéter. Or cette condition est celle d'un être qui ne peut trouver sa consistance en lui-même, mais seulement en Dieu à qui il est ordonné mais qu'il ne peut rejoindre qu'en brisant avec l'amour egoïste de soi pour s'ouvrir à la divine charité. Et dans cette perspective, la Passion et la mort du Christ constituent le moment essentiel de son œuvre rédemptrice car c'est en elles que s'exprime le plus parfaitement la charité comme amour qui se donne. Le *Dialogue ascétique* n'est pas seulement un condensé de l'*Anti-rrheticos*; il découvre le secret de la véritable gnose et nous donne sans doute ainsi le dernier mot de toute la pensée de Maxime en révélant le lien profond qui unit son œuvre spirituelle et la part de plus en plus déterminante qu'il prend aux controverses théologiques pour la défense de la christologie chalcédonienne. Il s'agissait en fin de compte de poursuivre en ses derniers retranchements l'origénisme anathématisé en 553 tout en sauvant et en poussant à leur plein épanouissement les vues les plus profondes d'Origène et d'Evagre sur l'unité qui doit en fin de compte s'établir entre la créature et Dieu au terme de ce mouvement qui prend son départ non dans une chute, dans un éloignement, mais dans un jaillissement à l'existence dès l'origine tout tendu, encore inconsciemment, vers Dieu (Amb., PG 91, 1072–1077).

Jean Cassien, historien du monachisme égyptien?

J. C. GUY S. J., Toulouse

Naguère, contre les outrances de H. Weingarten réduisant à de purs mythes les informations historiques fournies par Cassien sur le monachisme égyptien¹, Dom Cuthbert Butler avait sainement réagi en établissant la valeur historique de ce témoignage. Il allait jusqu'à écrire: "I think it is impossible to doubt the substantial truth of Cassian's picture of Egyptian monastic life, based, as it appears to be, upon the writer's personal observation"².

Aujourd'hui, les polémiques sur ce point sont heureusement éteintes. D'autre part, un travail énorme a été entrepris et déjà partiellement mené à bien concernant les premiers siècles de l'histoire du monachisme chrétien. Il semble donc possible de reprendre dans une perspective nouvelle cette question désormais dépassionnée, et d'examiner dans quelle mesure l'historien doit faire confiance au témoignage rendu par Jean Cassien sur la vie monastique en Basse-Égypte au IVème siècle. Une telle enquête devrait en même temps permettre de mieux comprendre dans quel esprit ont été écrites les *Institutions cénobitiques* et les *Conférences des anciens*.

Dans la présente communication, je ne prétends évidemment pas traiter ce problème de façon exhaustive, mais seulement présenter le résultat de quelques sondages. Je commencerai par une analyse critique de la petite Préface aux *Institutions cénobitiques*, spécialement importante sur ce point; j'examinerai ensuite la valeur historique de quelques-unes des informations, historiques, liturgiques ou autres, que l'on peut glâner dans l'ensemble de son œuvre.

¹ Ursprung des Mönchtums im nachconstantinischen Zeitalter, Gotha 1877, p. 67 sv.

² The Lausiac History of Palladius, vol. I, Cambridge 1898, p. 205.

Quelle que soit la date exacte retenue pour la rédaction des *Institutions cénobitiques* (problème difficilement soluble, et que je ne veux pas discuter ici), il est évident que ce ne put être avant 417—418: c'est la date la plus reculée, proposée par M. Olphe-Galliard¹; selon M. Cappuyns, «nous ne pouvons guère reculer au-delà de 424—425»²; O. Chadwick propose de même les environs de 425³.

A cette date, la littérature monastique en langue latine, qu'il s'agisse de textes originaux ou de traductions, est déjà abondante. Que l'on songe, par exemple, outre la *Vita Antonii* déjà deux fois traduite, à la traduction des Règles de Pachôme par saint Jérôme (404), ou à celle des *Ascetica* basiliens par Rufin ou à la *Vita Martini* et aux *Dialogues* de Sulpice-Sévère, pour ne rien dire du monachisme africain animé par saint Augustin.

Lorsque, à la demande de l'évêque d'Apt, Castor, il entreprend la rédaction des *Institutions cénobitiques*, Cassien connaît cette littérature et consacre précisément sa Préface à situer sa contribution personnelle par rapport à celles de ses prédécesseurs. L'originalité qu'il revendique pour son œuvre peut s'exprimer en trois traits:

1. Il annonce que son œuvre ne sera rien d'autre que le compte-rendu d'un *témoin oculaire*: . . . *instituta monasteriorum quae per Aegyptum ac Palestinam custodiri consperimus* (§ 3), . . . (*ea quae*) *vel agere temptavimus, vel didicimus, vel visu perceperimus* (§ 4), etc. De semblables expressions se rencontrent au moins six fois dans les neuf petits paragraphes de cette Préface.

2. Mais il y a plus. Indiquant que d'autres ont déjà écrit sur le même sujet (*sanctum Basiliūm et Hieronymūm dico aliosque nonnullos*), c'est toujours par ce même caractère de témoin oculaire qu'il définit son originalité par rapport à eux, ces prédécesseurs *qui audita potius quam experta describere temptaverunt* (§ 7). Ce faisant, il a bien conscience d'être original et de toucher une matière demeurée intacte jusqu'à lui: *ea quae omnimodis intacta relicta sunt ab anterioribus nostris intimabo*, — affirmation à laquelle fait écho la Préface au premier livre des *Conférences des anciens*, dans laquelle il déclare avoir traité, dans les *Institutions*

¹ Art. «Cassien» du Dictionnaire de spiritualité, II, 1, col. 217.

² Art. «Cassien» du Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques, XI, 1949, col. 1329.

³ John Cassian. A Study in primitive Monasticism, Cambridge 1950, p. 188—189.

cénobitiques, d'un sujet sur lequel on n'avait pas encore écrit auparavant: *quae in usu stili, ut arbitror, antea non venerunt* (§ 1).

3. Enfin il se présente des cas où les usages égyptiens qu'il a vus lui-même et expérimentés ne pourraient pas être appliqués littéralement dans les Gaules, pour des raisons climatiques ou autres. Il faut donc une adaptation. Ici encore, si Cassien adapte et assouplit les usages égyptiens, ce ne sera pas selon son propre jugement, mais en les tempérant à l'aide des institutions en vigueur en Palestine et en Mésopotamie.

Bref, témoignage oculaire, inédit, que l'auteur se refuse à modifier ou à adapter de sa propre autorité: tel est le projet explicitement proclamé par Cassien au moment où il s'apprête à écrire pour la première fois sur les moines d'Égypte.

Qu'en est-il réellement? Cassien a-t-il rempli fidèlement le programme qu'il annonce? Je voudrais à ce propos faire les observations suivantes.

1º. Tout le monde sait que les *Institutions cénobitiques* s'articulent en deux grandes parties, les quatre premiers livres consacrés à ce que Cassien appelle la «formation de l'homme extérieur», et les huit suivants qui commentent le catalogue des huit vices principaux. Cette deuxième partie, S. Marsili l'a démontré¹, est fortement inspirée par les explications d'Évagre le Pontique sur ce même catalogue dont il est d'ailleurs l'auteur (cf. *Practicos*, *De octo vitiosis cogitationibus*, *Antirrheticos*), même si, comme H. O. Weber l'a récemment mis en lumière², Cassien se permet certaines transpositions de la doctrine de son modèle pour mieux l'adapter à un cadre de vie cénobitique.

Contrairement à ce qu'annonçait Cassien, on ne peut donc pas dire des huit derniers livres des *Institutions cénobitiques* que *in usum stili, ut arbitror, antea non venerunt*. Ils propagent en Occident une doctrine déjà bien exposée en Orient.

Or, pour les quatre premiers livres, une constatation analogue s'impose. A l'occasion d'une nouvelle édition des *Institutions cénobitiques* que je viens de terminer pour la collection «Sources Chrétiennes», j'ai cherché à identifier quelques-unes des sources

¹ Giovanni Cassiano ed Evagrio Pontico, *Studia Anselmiana* 5, Rome 1936.

² Die Stellung des Johannes Cassianus zur außerpachomianischen Mönchstradition, Münster 1960.

dont dépend Cassien. Il se trouve que, dans les trois premiers livres, abondent déjà réminiscences pachomiennes et citations presque littérales, même s'il faut attendre le début du livre IV pour être informé que, dans les développements qui suivront, certains éléments seront empruntés à la Règle des Tabennésiotes¹. Il s'agit non seulement du récit, adapté de l'*Histoire Lausiaque* et de la *Vita tertia graeca*, de l'origine angélique de la Règle (II, 5 sv.), mais aussi de nombreuses prescriptions relatives à la prière, au sommeil, à la nourriture, au travail manuel, à la pénitence . . . qui sont puisées à la Règle pachomienne dont saint Jérôme avait publié la traduction latine en 404. Or, c'est certainement à cette traduction que se réfère Cassien lorsqu'il écrit dans sa Préface, à propos de ses prédécesseurs: *alius (Hieronymus) non solum elucubratos ingenio edidit libros, verum etiam graeca lingua digestos in latinum vertit eloquium.* Sans aucun doute possible, Cassien connaît cette traduction, il s'en inspire (tout de même que dans les livres V–XII il s'inspire d'Evagre le Pontique), et pourtant il revendique l'originalité d'exposer dans les *Institutions cénotibiques* «ea quae omnimodis intacta reicta sunt ab anterioribus nostris», «quae in usum stili, ut arbitror, antea non venerunt».

Contrairement à son affirmation explicite et répétée, ce ne sont donc pas des informations inédites que Cassien donne à ses lecteurs dans les douze livres des *Institutions*. Qu'il suffise pour le moment d'avoir signalé cette première contradiction, remettant à plus tard un essai d'explication.

2º Si, malgré son affirmation explicite et répétée, Cassien ne donne pas que des informations inédites, mais s'inspire des écrits de ses prédécesseurs, peut-on dire du moins qu'il fut le témoin oculaire des faits et expériences qu'il rapporte? Il le prétend, comme je l'ai rappelé en commençant. Mais, en fait, qu'en est-il?

Il n'est pas trop malaisé de déterminer quels centres monastiques égyptiens Cassien a visités en compagnie de son ami Germain. M. Cappuyns l'a fait dans son article du *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques*, dont je me contenterai de rappeler présentement les conclusions sur ce point. Les deux voyageurs quittent leur monastère de Bethléem et débarquent à

¹ . . . quaedam scilicet de Aegyptiorum, quaedam de Tabennesiatarum regulis admissentes, quorum Thebaide est coenobium . . . (*Institutions*, IV, 1).

Thennesus, dans les bouches du Nil, première étape de leur périple. De là, ils se rendent à Panéphysis et dans les ermitages environnants, puis vont passer quelque temps à Diolcos, avant de retourner faire un nouveau séjour à Panéphysis. Toutes ces localités sont situées dans la région côtière. Ensuite, ils «se hâtent» vers Scété où ils s'installent, et qu'ils ne quittèrent, semble-t-il, que pour un très rapide¹ retour à Bethléem afin de prendre un congé définitif de leurs premiers maîtres. Rien ne permet d'affirmer que Cassien ait visité d'autres centres monastiques que ceux que je viens de mentionner. Plus particulièrement, comme le note Cappuyns, «il n'est pas probable qu'il ait donné suite à son projet de pousser jusqu'en Thébaide et à Tabennes»². Encore moins se serait-il rendu en Mésopotamie.

Or, non seulement il annonce dans la Préface aux *Institutions cénobitiques* qu'il tempérera la règle des égyptiens par les institutions en vigueur en Palestine et en Mésopotamie³, mais il se réfère aussi à de nombreux usages pachômiens. Il est vrai qu'il a existé assez tôt une communauté pachômienne installée dans le Delta, à Canope, et que, même s'il n'en parle pas, Cassien aurait pu la visiter en se rendant de Diolcos à Scété. C'est pourtant aux communautés de la Haute-Égypte qu'il se réfère explicitement⁴, et c'est la vie dans le coenobium tabennésiote qu'il décrit au début du livre IV des *Institutions cénobitiques* et dans la XX^e Conférence des anciens.

Il est donc clair que, même s'il a une expérience personnelle et prolongée de la vie monastique en Égypte, Cassien ne se contente pas de rapporter ce que *vel agere temptavimus, vel didicimus vel visu perceperimus*⁵. Les *Institutions cénobitiques* et les Conférences des anciens sont l'œuvre d'un témoin oculaire, mais ne sont pas que cela.

Telles sont les deux observations que je voulais faire à propos de la Préface aux *Institutions cénobitiques*, et du double caractère qu'y revendique Cassien pour sa contribution à l'histoire monastique égyptienne. Il faudra se demander pourquoi il y a un

¹ Conférences, XVII, 30,2.

² Art. cit., col. 1323.

³ ... ut ea quae secundum Aegyptiorum regulam impossibilia vel dura vel ardua comprobavero institutis monasteriorum quae per Palestinam vel Mespotamiam habentur aliquatenus temperem... (Institutions, Préface 9).

⁴ Quorum Thebaide est coenobium (Institutions, IV, 1).

⁵ Institutions, Préface 4.

tel décalage entre ce qu'il prétend faire et ce qu'il réalise effectivement.

Mais, auparavant, je voudrais proposer un rapide sondage sur ce qu'on pourrait appeler la «qualité historique» des renseignements qu'il fournit concernant le monachisme égyptien. Je grouperai mes remarques autour de trois rubriques: d'abord ce qui concerne les évènements proprement historiques, puis les renseignements historiques, et enfin les renseignements topographiques et biographiques.

1. Pour ce qui est de l'origine historique de l'institution monastique dont Cassien parle à deux reprises au moins, on connaît la remarquable analyse faite par A. de Vogüé de la double version, alexandrine et hiérosolymitaine, du mythe développé par Cassien pour en montrer l'origine apostolique. A ce propos, l'auteur n'hésite pas à parler de «flagrant délit de fabrication historique»¹. Il n'est pas besoin d'y insister.

Mais il est beaucoup plus surprenant de constater la façon dont Cassien a traité un évènement dans lequel il a pourtant été engagé, et dont les répercussions furent si grandes non seulement sur sa propre vie, mais plus encore sur l'orientation de la spiritualité monastique. Je veux parler de la condamnation de l'anthropomorphisme par le patriarche d'Alexandrie, Théophile, en 399, puis du retournement de position de ce même patriarche, et de la persécution qu'il fit alors subir aux moines suspects d'origénisme.

Sur l'essentiel de cette lamentable histoire, nous sommes assez bien renseignés. Cassien vivait alors à Scété et, dans sa dixième *Conférence des anciens*, il porte lui aussi son témoignage sur les évènements. Or il se trouve que la version qu'il donne des faits diverge grandement de celle de tous les autres témoins. Selon lui, en effet, presque tous les moines de la Province d'Égypte étaient tombés dans l'hérésie des anthropomorphites condamnée par la Lettre Festale de Théophile, à l'exception de la seule congrégation réunie autour de l'abba Paphnuce à Scété, qui eut lui-même bien du mal à persuader certains membres de son entourage à souscrire à la condamnation². Cassien ne va pas plus loin.

¹ Monachisme et Église dans la pensée de Cassien, dans Théologie de la vie monastique, Paris 1961, p. 218.

² Cf. Conférences, X, 1-2.

Or, aucune des autres sources ne nous parle du groupe de Panphnuce à Scété, mais tous mentionnent les moines *nitriotes* réunis autour des quatre «Longs Frères» et plus ou moins disciples d'Évagre le Pontique, et qui, sur ce point, étaient restés fidèles à l'orthodoxie.

Cette divergence n'est qu'un détail. Mais il y a plus grave. Nous savons qu'après avoir condamné l'anthropomorphisme, Théophile changea d'attitude et s'en prit bientôt aux moines adversaires de l'anthropomorphisme et réputés origéniens, les «Longs Frères» et leurs adeptes, les expulsa de Nitrie et les poursuivit de sa hargne jusqu'à Constantinople où ceux-ci s'étaient réfugiés auprès de Jean Chrysostome. De tout cela, Cassien qui vivait alors en Basse-Égypte, dans le Wâdi'n Natrûn, et dont l'effort sera précisément de proposer une doctrine spirituelle qui, par Évagre le Pontique, doit beaucoup à Origène, ne dit rien. On conçoit sans peine les raisons pour lesquelles il préféra garder le silence sur ce triste épisode que les rudes moines gaulois auraient eu du mal à bien comprendre, et qui aurait risqué de disqualifier plutôt à leurs yeux la doctrine qu'il voulait leur inculquer. Mais il n'en reste pas moins que, sur ce point, Cassien n'apparaît pas comme un témoin fidèle de l'histoire monastique égyptienne.

2. Pour ce qui est des renseignements fournis par Cassien dans le domaine des institutions liturgiques, je ne m'y arrêterai guère. Je voudrais seulement signaler le résultat de deux très récentes études sur deux points particuliers.

D'abord, sur la façon de célébrer le temps de la Cinquantaine qui suit la solennité pascale. A deux reprises¹, Cassien note que c'est un ancien usage monastique en Égypte que de ne pas flétrir le genou pour la prière durant tout ce temps, et de ne pas y prolonger le jeûne jusqu'à la neuvième heure, mais d'y suivre le même régime que pour tous les dimanches de l'année. Or, la récente thèse de R. Cabié montre qu'il ne s'agit pas tant là d'un usage monastique, comme le prétend Cassien, que de l'usage en vigueur depuis longtemps dans l'Église d'Alexandrie².

Il y a aussi cette *novella solennitas matutina* (que certains veulent identifier à Prime et d'autres à Laudes). Cassien en donne

¹ Institutions, II, 18 et Conférences, XXI, 11–20.

² La Pentecôte. L'évolution de la Cinquantaine pascale au cours des cinq premiers siècles, Desclée et Cie, Tournai 1965.

la description au livre III des *Institutions cénobitiques*, où il précise qu'elle a été instituée de son temps, dans le monastère de Bethléem où il demeurait¹. Or, J. Matéos vient de montrer, à l'aide de l'*In Matthaeum* de saint Jean Chrysostome, que cette nouvelle célébration est d'origine antiochienne et non palestinienne, et qu'elle a été instituée notamment avant que Cassien ne soit admis au monastère de Bethléem².

3. Reste enfin le troisième groupe de remarques que je voulais faire. Elles concernent les renseignements topographiques et prosopographiques. Il faut noter d'abord que ces renseignements sont rares, et qu'à eux seuls ils ne permettraient pas de dresser un tableau, même sommaire, de l'Égypte monastique au IVème siècle. De plus, ces renseignements sont très imprécis. J'en prendrai deux exemples.

a) *Localisation du désert dit «des Cellules»*. Bien que résidant à Scété, Cassien connaît le désert des Cellules qui n'est pas tellement lointain, puisqu'il dit s'y être rendu et y avoir rencontré abba Théodore auquel est attribuée la VIème *Conférence des anciens*. Toutes les sources qui nous informent sur la géographie monastique de la Basse-Égypte au IVème siècle non seulement mentionnent les Cellules, mais nous indiquent même la distance à laquelle se trouve ce désert de celui de Nitrie. L'*Historia monachorum in Aegypto* parle de dix milles environ³, Sozomène de soixante-dix stades⁴, le Récit de fondation de douze *sèmeia*⁵, c'est-à-dire une distance qui, selon les témoins, oscille entre treize et dix-huit kilomètres. Seul Cassien donne une information sensiblement divergente: *a monasteritis quidem Nitriae millibus distans*⁶, c'est-à-dire environ sept kilomètres.

b) *Abba Moïse*. Cassien parle de deux abbas Moïse. Le premier, Moïse dit de Scété, est le porte-parole des Conférences I et II et son éloge est fait à plusieurs reprises par ailleurs⁷. Les quelques renseignements que l'on peut extraire de ces notices s'harmonisent sans peine avec les nombreuses données fournies par

¹ *Nostro tempore in nostroque monasterio primitus institutam* (*Institutions*, III, 4,1).

² L'office monastique à la fin du IVème siècle: Antioche, Palestine, Cappadoce, dans *Oriens Christianus*, Bd. 47, 1963, pp. 53-88.

³ Ch. 22; PL 21, 444 B.

⁴ Hist. Eccl. VI, 31; PG 67, 1388 B.

⁵ *Apophthegmata Patrum*, Alphab., Antoine 34; PG 65, 88 A.

⁶ Conférences, VI, 1,3.

⁷ *Institutions*, X, 25; Conférences, XIX, 9,1.

l'*Histoire lausiaque*¹ et les *Apophthegmata Patrum*² concernant Moïse, ancien voleur et meurtrier, éthiopien d'origine et demeurant à Scété.

Mais Cassien connaît aussi un second Moïse, dit de Calame, dont il parle en deux endroits³. Calame est un désert que Cassien présente comme fort éloigné de Scété et difficilement accessible: *septem siquidem vel octo mansionibus vastissimae solitudinis . . .*, précise-t-il par deux fois⁴. Cet *heremus Calami seu Porphyronis* se trouve situé, en effet, non loin de la mer Rouge. Pourtant, Cassien rapporte un épisode concernant Macaire de Scété et Moïse de Calame, épisode invraisemblable s'ils habitent vraiment à sept ou huit jours de marche l'un de l'autre⁵. Il y a plus. Cassien raconte en ces termes la vocation monastique de son Moïse de Calame (dont aucune autre source ne parle): *Nec enim abbati Moysi qui habitavit in loco istius heremi qui Calamus nuncupatur quicquam defuit ad perfectae beatitudinis meritum quod metu mortis quae ei propter homicidii crimen intentabatur, impulsus ad monasterium decucurrit*⁶. Or, le même renseignement se trouve dans l'*Histoire lausiaque*, mais à propos de Moïse de Scété, l'ancien voleur, auquel appartient la première série de textes que j'ai indiqués précédemment: «On disait de lui qu'il se laissa aller jusqu'à commettre des meurtres»⁷.

Il est donc raisonnable de conclure que Cassien ne se rend pas compte qu'il parle, dans les deux cas, d'un moine unique, qu'il fait vivre une fois à Scété et l'autre fois au bord de la mer Rouge, dans le désert éloigné et inaccessible de Calame.

Certains trouveront peut-être un peu trop pessimiste le tableau que je viens de brosser à très grands traits. En réalité, en mettant en garde contre une trop facile crédulité à l'égard de Cassien historien, mon intention n'était nullement de jeter le discrédit sur la personne ou sur l'œuvre. Bien au contraire.

On a dit que c'est pour des raisons de prudence qu'il n'a jamais voulu citer nommément Évagre le Pontique que pourtant il

¹ Ch. 19; Butler, p. 58-62.

² PG 65, 281-289.

³ Conférences, III, 5,2 et VII, 26,2 sv.

⁴ Institutions, X, 24; Conférences, XXIV, 4,2.

⁵ Cf. Conférences, VII, 27.

⁶ Conférences, III, 5,2.

⁷ Ch. 19; Butler, p. 58,17.

utilise abondamment. Il est incontestable que l'intellectualisme évagrien avait de quoi effaroucher bien des esprits, et qu'il était donc plus prudent de reprendre certains éléments de sa doctrine sans le dire explicitement. Mais la prudence est-elle le seul motif? Je ne le pense pas. Elle ne peut suffire, en tout cas, à expliquer la réserve analogue dont il fait preuve lorsqu'il s'agit de citer soit les Règles de Pachôme dont pourtant il s'inspire souvent, soit les œuvres de son maître, saint Jean Chrysostome, dont le seul nom lui aurait pourtant valu en Occident un *brevet d'orthodoxie*.

Que, d'autre part, Cassien insiste pour présenter son œuvre comme un simple témoignage oculaire, un reportage objectif, ne doit pas nous donner le change. Nous l'avons vu se permettre bien des libertés avec l'objectivité historique. En fait, Cassien n'a rien d'un historien : il est un théoricien de la vie spirituelle, et un théoricien d'une originalité et d'une profondeur remarquable. Il est un homme à qui une très vaste expérience et une grande culture ont permis, selon l'image utilisée dans la *Vita Antonii* et reprise dans les *Institutions cénobitiques*, d'aller, telle l'abeille, butiner sur toutes les fleurs. Le résultat en est une doctrine, aussi irréductible à chacune des sources dont elle s'inspire que ne l'est le miel à chacune des fleurs dont il est fait.

Que, par ailleurs, il ait tenu à donner à son œuvre l'allure extérieure d'un simple reportage historique se comprend sans peine. En réaction contre l'effervescence d'un monachisme latin assez peu organisé, sans traditions solides et trop sensible au «merveilleux» (ces *mirabilia Dei* dont il se refuse de parler), Cassien a reçu pour mission d'insuffler un esprit authentiquement monastique aux nouveaux groupements qui viennent de se constituer en Provence¹. Pour le faire, il lui fallait comme des *Lettres de recommandation*. Or, le monachisme égyptien jouissait aux yeux de tous d'un très grand prestige. La meilleure façon de donner du poids à son enseignement n'était-elle pas de le mettre dans la bouche des plus célèbres parmi les moines d'Égypte?

¹ Cf. Saint Martin et son temps (*Studia Anselmiana* 46), Rome 1961; voir surtout la première partie de cet ouvrage où est brossé un tableau du monachisme occidental à la fin du IVème siècle.

Recherches sur l'origénisme d'Origène: la «satiété» (*κόρος*) de la contemplation comme motif de la chute des âmes

MARGUERITE HARL, Paris

Les griefs formulés contre Origène au cours des divers conflits doctrinaux, à la fin du IVème et au milieu du VIème siècles, font apparaître les grandes lignes d'un système que nous appelons «d'origénisme»¹. Bien que ces griefs soient formulés en référence explicite à l'œuvre même d'Origène, on sait quelles difficultés éprouvent les historiens pour retrouver précisément dans ce qui nous reste de l'auteur alexandrin l'origine des erreurs condamnées : doctrine des âmes préexistantes et de leur chute, eschatologie, christologie, allégorisme, etc. Une explication de cette difficulté est que nous ne possédons plus le texte original grec du *Traité des Principes*, où le système d'Origène se trouvait exposé, non plus que les autres ouvrages les plus spéculatifs de notre auteur, ceux de sa première période². On peut d'autre part supposer que l'origénisme condamné serait non pas celui d'Origène lui-même mais un origénisme plus accusé, celui de disciples tardifs³. Notre hypothèse de travail est un peu différente : il nous semble bien que l'essentiel des thèses «origénistes» remonte à Origène lui-même, à ses ouvrages, et que l'on peut, par exemple, retrouver dans la traduction latine du *Traité des Principes* les grandes lignes du système condamné⁴; mais ce système s'accom-

¹ Sur les querelles «origénistes», voir F. Diekamp, *Die originistischen Streitigkeiten im sechsten Jahrhundert und das fünfte allgemeine Concil*, Münster, 1899. L'ouvrage récent de A. Guillaumont, *Les «Kephalia Gnostica» d'Evagre le Pontique et l'histoire de l'origénisme chez les Grecs et chez les Syriens*, Paris, 1962, est maintenant le meilleur instrument de travail pour un état de la question.

² Les Stromates, le Traité de la Résurrection et, surtout, les Tomes de Commentaire sur la Genèse.

³ C'est ce que l'ouvrage d'A. Guillaumont a parfaitement montré pour certains points de l'origénisme condamné au VIème siècle.

⁴ Certains auteurs, prenant appui sur le Traité des Principes, n'hésitent pas à décrire le système «origéniste»; ainsi J. Denis, *De la philosophie d'Or-*

pagnait chez Origène d'un contexte spirituel¹; devait probablement s'interpréter de son vivant avec des résonances spirituelles, tandis que par la suite un certain durcissement des citations, isolées de leur contexte, déformait le sens originel. Il est assez fréquent, dans l'histoire des doctrines, d'assister à une schématisation excessive de doctrines d'abord souples et complexes: on finit par n'en retenir que leurs affirmations métaphysiques. Ce phénomène est particulièrement frappant si l'on veut bien faire l'histoire de certaines formules: ce qui était d'abord une simple image descriptive, avec tout le flou et la complexité que comporte une expression imagée, est peu à peu pris pour une notion philosophique, au sens élaboré et grave. Nous voudrions exposer ici un exemple particulièrement frappant de ce phénomène: c'est un point de l'origénisme qui peut paraître très limité mais qui, en fait, met en cause tout le système, parce qu'il est tout à fait central, névralgique. C'est le motif de la chute des âmes préexistantes.

Les documents antiorigénistes du VIème siècle ont rapporté une formule, d'interprétation difficile, selon laquelle les premières créatures spirituelles, faites pour partager la bonté divine, auraient été prises d'une «satiété» (*χόρος*) de la contemplation et se seraient, par suite de ce sentiment, «détournées» de Dieu²

gène, Paris, 1884; et même certaines pages de F. Prat, Origène, le théologien et l'exégète, Paris, 1907, ou de R. Cadiou, Introduction au système d'Origène, Paris, 1932, ou de J. Daniélou, Origène, Paris, 1948. Ces auteurs ne cherchent pas à cacher les doctrines les plus spéculatives d'Origène, sur la préexistence des âmes ou l'eschatologie par exemple, tout en évitant de présenter le théologien chrétien comme un pur philosophe, enseignant un système apparenté à la gnose ou au néoplatonisme, ce que font par exemple H. Jonas, *Gnosis und spätantiker Geist*, Göttingen, 1954, et récemment C. Tresmontant, La métaphysique du christianisme et la naissance de la philosophie chrétienne, Paris, 1961. La présentation la plus équilibrée nous paraît être celle de J. Daniélou.

¹ Toutes les études actuelles sur Origène doivent tenir compte de l'Origène «spirituel», tel que W. Völker, *Das Vollkommenheitsideal des Origenes*, Tübingen, 1931, a contribué à le présenter (voir aussi les volumes d'Homélies publiés dans la Collection Sources Chrétiennes). Nous tiendrons compte conjointement de ces deux certitudes, indiscutables à nos yeux: il existe un «système origéniste» dans les grands ouvrages d'Origène (*Traité des Principes*, Tomes du Commentaire sur l'Evangile de Jean, *Contre Celse*); ce système s'articule librement dans le contexte d'une spiritualité chrétienne authentique, qui doit donner sa couleur à l'ensemble.

² On peut lire chez A. Guillaumont, op. cit., p. 140 sq., une traduction des anathématismes de 543 et de 553. Texte grec ap. E. Schwartz, *Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum . . .* (Berlin-Leipzig, 1914 sq.) vol. III, p. 213 sq. Voir Diekamp,

(Dieu aurait alors créé le monde matériel, pour que ces âmes déchues y soient envoyées et y trouvent le moyen de montrer leur vertu, pour un jour revenir à leur bonté initiale¹). Quel sens faut-il donner à cette expression? La trouve-t-on chez Origène? Si les premières créatures spirituelles ont une fois éprouvé un sentiment de «satiété» en présence du bien, cela ne veut-il pas dire qu'il y aurait une sorte de «comble» du bien, de point de saturation, de point extrême à partir duquel les âmes ne pourraient que repartir en un mouvement inverse, comme cela arrive pour le «comble» du mal, inspirant le dégoût²? En l'absence de texte authentique d'Origène qui rapporte expressément cette doctrine³, on peut être tenté de le laver de tout soupçon, d'affirmer que l'expression des anathématismes (*χόρον λαβεῖν τῆς θεωρίας*) est une pure invention ou, plus exactement, se réfère à un texte «origéniste» postérieur à Origène⁴. Nous ne pensons pas cela:

op. cit., p. 90–96. L'éditeur du *Traité des Principes* dans la collection des GCS (Leipzig 1913), P. Koetschau, a cité les anathématismes dans le texte même de son édition, p. 159 (voir son introduction, p. CXIX sq.).

¹ Nous ne doutons pas, quant à nous, qu'Origène ait réellement enseigné la préexistence des âmes et le caractère secondaire, consécutif à la chute des âmes, de la création matérielle: Dieu a créé, pour les âmes déchues, un réceptacle approprié, avec des lieux divers correspondant aux classes diverses des âmes déchues; le monde des corps est un lieu d'éducation, d'épreuve, pour que les âmes y exercent leur vertu et méritent un jour, en suivant le Verbe incarné, et avec l'aide de la grâce divine, de faire leur «retour» à la bonté initiale. Ce n'est pas le lieu, ici, d'apporter sur ces sujets la preuve qu'Origène les avait enseignés.

² Voir J. Daniélou, *La colombe et la ténèbre dans la mystique byzantine ancienne*, Eranos-Jahrbuch XXIII, Zürich, 1955, p. 389–418 (p. 417); H. Cornélis, *Les fondements cosmologiques de l'eschatologie d'Origène*, Paris, 1959, p. 85; J. Daniélou, *Comble du mal et eschatologie chez Grégoire de Nysse*, Festgabe Lortz, 1957, p. 27–45 (voir p. 39); P. Sherwood, *The early Ambigua of St. Maximus the Confessor and his Refutation of Origenism*, Studia Anselmiana 36, 1955, p. 181–204.

³ Aucun parallèle dans la traduction de Rufin à l'endroit où Koetschau a glissé ces extraits des anathématismes (II 8,3 p. 159).

⁴ A. Guillaumont, op. cit. p. 142, note à la fois que le thème de la «satiété de la contemplation divine» est *nouveau*, comme grief antiorigéniste, par rapport aux formules incriminées à la fin du IVème siècle et que l'on *ne peut pas* en trouver l'origine chez Evagre (la chute de l'intellect a été, selon Evagre, une suite de la «négligence»). J'ignore pourquoi les textes de la fin du IVème siècle n'utilisent pas la formule *χόρον λαβεῖν τῆς θεωρίας* pour en reprocher l'emploi à Origène mais je suis certaine, comme cette étude le montrera, que l'idée n'était pas nouvelle lorsqu'elle apparaît dans les dossiers antiorigénistes du VIème siècle et qu'elle n'est pas différente, d'ailleurs, de l'idée d'une «négligence» de l'intellect.

nous lisons plusieurs fois l'expression *κόρον λαβεῖν* ou le verbe *κορέννυσθαι* dans des textes authentiques d'Origène¹; il n'est donc pas impossible qu'il l'ait employé pour nommer le motif de la chute des âmes préexistantes. Reste à préciser quel sens il donnait à ces mots, ou, plutôt, quel degré de technicité philosophique ce mot avait dans sa langue, à son époque. Nous devons procéder par une double comparaison: d'une part avec l'emploi du mot *κόρος* en dehors d'Origène (pour apprendre, notamment, de quoi on pouvait l'accuser, si l'on donnait à ce mot un sens qu'il avait par ailleurs), d'autre part avec l'ensemble des autres termes qui nomment, chez Origène, le motif de la chute des âmes (*κόρος* obligatoirement doit s'accorder avec ces autres mots, son sens est déterminé par sa situation au sein d'un groupe de termes analogues).

Rappelons d'abord l'usage de *κόρος* dans le grec classique. Ce terme, très ancien, est une image qui prit vite une grande importance dans la langue morale. *Kόρος* nomme l'état de quelqu'un qui s'est bien repu (*κορέννυσθαι*)²; c'est, à proprement parler, sans nuance péjorative, le fait du «rassasiement»: du bétail éprouve le *κόρος* lorsqu'il se repaît d'un gras pâturage; un homme l'éprouve au terme d'un banquet au cours duquel nourritures et boissons étaient à sa disposition en abondance. Les mots les plus fréquemment associés à *κόρος* indiquent l'opulence (*δλθος*, *πλοῦτος*, *τρυφή*, *ἀφθονία* etc. . . .). Or l'observation quotidienne montre qu'il est très difficile pour l'homme de supporter le «rassasiement» sans tomber dans l'*excès* de la satisfaction: la morale grecque la plus traditionnelle utilise le mot *κόρος* pour nommer cet excès, en un sens tout à fait analogue à celui d'*ὕβρις*. Le «rassasiement» devient avidité gloutonne, insatiabilité, désir exacerbé, excitation, arrogance, insolence³. Des textes de Solon, de

¹ Trois emplois concernent la satiété du mal: De oratione 29,3, C. Celsum V 29, Fr. in Exodum 5 (Philocalie, ed. Robinson p. 246,14). Le verbe *κορέννυσθαι* signifie «se gorger» au point d'en éprouver du dégoût, de la haine, et d'avoir envie de «se détourner». Le quatrième exemple, C. Celsum VI 44, ed. Koetschau p. 115,18, donne au verbe *κορέννυσθαι*, comme objet du «rassasiement», «des biens» dont disposait l'Ange avant sa chute: *τῶν ἀγαθῶν*. Ce texte entre dans une tradition que nous étudierons plus loin, à propos de Philon. Il faut encore signaler les passages de la traduction latine du Traité des Principes où sont employés les mots *tedium* et *satietas*, correspondant probablement à *κόρος*. Nous analyserons ces textes plus loin.

² Il n'est pas impossible que le mot *κόρος*, jeune homme, rejeton, se rattache également à la racine *Ker* signifiant «se repaître».

³ Voir Pindare, Olympiques XIII 12; Eschyle, Agamemnon 381 sq.

Théognis, des poètes, prouvent à l'évidence l'emploi moral de l'image: le *κόρος*, c'est la faute de gens trop heureux, qui n'ont pas su respecter la mesure, qui ont été énivrés, grisés, par leur bonheur, par l'ivresse d'un festin¹. Chez Platon, la même idée est exprimée avec des mots comme *πλησιονή* ou *ἀπληστία*: l'homme tombe dans l'insatiabilité s'il ne sait pas régler la nourriture de ses sens². Lorsque le mot *κόρος* entre dans des expressions ayant pour sujet non plus celui qui s'est rassasié mais la chose qui l'a

¹ Voir la forme gnomique, chez Solon, rapportée par Aristote, Constitution d'Athènes V 3 et XII 2 (*τίκτει γὰρ κόρος ὑβρίν ὅταν πολὺς δλβος ἐπηται/ἀνθρώποισιν δύοις μὴ νόος ἀγτιος ή*) (cf. Diogène Laerce I 59). Voir aussi l'oracle rapporté par Hérodote VIII 77. Chez Théognis, on trouve explicitée l'idée que le *κόρος* provient de la méconnaissance de la juste mesure (v. 693—694 Bergk. Voir aussi 153—154). Les dits de Solon et de Théognis sont cités par Clément d'Alexandrie, Stromates VI 8 (voir aussi Plutarque, Solon). La même conception du *κόρος* source d'*ὑβρίς*, mère de tous les maux, est attribuée à Pythagore, selon Stobée, Flor. 43, 79, mais Jamblique (Vie de Pythagore 171) rapporte la formule non pas avec les quatre termes *τρυφή* — *κόρος* — *ὑβρίς* — *δλεθρος*, seulement avec *τρυφή*, *ὑβρίς*, *δλεθρος*. L'existence des deux formes proverbiales *τίκτει κόρος ὑβριν «et» ὑβρις κόρου μάγτηρ* montre à quel point les mots *κόρος* et *ὑβρίς* étaient ressentis comme équivalents. Nous ne possédons pas, en français, un mot qui rende bien ce sens de *κόρος*: «insatiabilité» semble le meilleur. En italien, *avarizia* (voir Carlo del Grande, *Hybris*, Naples, 1947, p. 47—52).

² Il est bien visible que, pour les Grecs, la faute de *κόρος* — *ὑβρίς* marqua la fin de l'*Age d'or*, tel qu'Hésiode le décrivait (Op. 109 sq.), lorsque, «du temps de Cronos», les hommes vivaient au milieu des biens, libres de soucis, dans la joie et la paix, sans connaître la folle démesure. Platon reprend le thème du «temps de Cronos» et explique pourquoi, alors, les hommes vivaient sans connaître la «démesure»: c'est que le Dieu, sachant l'homme incapable de régler ses affaires sans se gonfler de démesure et d'injustice (*μὴ οὐχ ὑβρεώς τε καὶ ἀδικίας μεστοῦσθαι*), avait proposé à l'humanité des êtres d'une race supérieure, les démons, chargés de distribuer la nourriture (la loi, *νόμος*, est la *διαρομή τοῦ νοῦ*) (Lois 713c—714a). Dans le Politique 271—272, il dit aussi que tout va bien pour les «nourrissons de Cronos» s'ils ne se «gorgent pas à satiété» (*ἐμπιπλάμενοι . . . ἀδηροι*). (Ce passage du Politique, notons le, figure dans le dossier des textes de Platon qu'Eusèbe met en parallèle avec les textes de Moïse, en Préparation Evangélique XII 13, pour illustrer le thème d'une vie initiale bienheureuse; c'est à ses yeux l'équivalent de la vie paradisiaque). La morale de Platon, en demandant à l'homme d'obéir à «ce qui en lui est divin», vise à reproduire le mode de vie «du temps de Cronos», lorsque les hommes obéissaient aux démons et ne connaissaient pas le désir insatiable (Lois 713—714). L'*ἀπληστία* signifie chez Platon à la fois l'impossibilité de se remplir (l'âme «ne retient rien», *στέγουσα οὐδέν*) et le désir sans fin de se remplir (voir l'image des tonneaux percés). Sur la fin de l'*Age d'or* et la faute d'insatiabilité, voir Maxime de Tyr XXXVI 1—2 (il n'y a pas plus le mot *κόρος* que chez Platon).

rassasié, ces expressions signifient que les choses les plus agréables procurent la satiété, et même le dégoût, lorsqu'on en abuse. Ainsi le sommeil, le miel, l'amitié, l'amour peuvent-ils procurer la satiété (*κόρον ἔχειν*), devenir écoeurants (*προσκορεῖς*). *Kόρος* nomme alors le seuil de saturation, le dégoût¹.

L'usage gnomique de *κόρος*, dans des formules comme «l'opulence engendre le rassasiement; celui-ci fait naître la démesure, qui à son tour entraîne tous les malheurs»², subsiste sans changements à l'époque post-classique. Philon d'Alexandrie en fait un grand emploi³ et atteste même l'existence d'une sorte de figure allégorique (le Koros Hybristes)⁴, bien accordée à certaines notions de sa morale: le *κόρος* est la faute de celui qui manque de maîtrise de soi, d'*ἐγκράτεια*⁵. D'autre part, chez Philon, le *κόρος* n'est pas seulement l'excitation insolente de celui qui s'est gorgé de bonnes choses; c'est aussi l'engourdissement de l'intellect dont les sens se sont trop repus; c'est la torpeur qui envahit l'homme, par suite de sa paresse à maîtriser les sens, de sa négligence, d'une façon générale de son manque de vigilance. *Kόρος* n'est plus seulement le *κόρος-ὕβρις*: c'est le *κόρος-ὕπνος* (l'ivresse qui endort, non plus celle qui excite), associé aux notions de *ράθυμία* et de *ἀμέλεια*⁶. Enfin, nous devinons chez

¹ Le seul exemple de *κόρος* chez Platon est celui du Phèdre 240c, où *κόρον ἔχειν* signifie «lasser»; dans le Politique 272 bc, Platon emploie *ἄδην* (cf. Char-mide 153 d: *ἄδην ἔχειν*, en avoir assez). Voir dans le Lexique de Ast les exemples, nombreux, de *πλησμονή*. Une deuxième référence peut être donnée pour *κόρος*, à condition de modifier l'interprétation habituelle de Cratyle 396 b dans le sens que nous proposerons plus loin (voir p. 400, n. 4). Les composés de *κόρος* (*διακορής*, *προσκορής*) signifient «écoeurants», «fastidieux».

² C'est la forme attribuée à Pythagore chez Stobée.

³ Plus de vingt-cinq exemples de *κόρος* chez Philon, la plus grande part dans le sens gnomique. On peut suivre le destin de cet usage chez Clément d'Alexandrie et les auteurs chrétiens, mais cela ne concerne pas l'objet précis de notre enquête.

⁴ De Providentia 2, 12 ed. Colson (Loeb, vol. IX), p. 464: jouir des biens de la nature, ne pas s'en contenter, mais prendre pour guide de la vie le Koros Hybristes.

⁵ L'intempérance s'appelle *ἀμετρία*, *ἀκρασία*, *ἀπληστία*. Philon attribue la faute de *κόρος* à celui qui laisse les sens se gorger à satiété de nourritures abondantes (*ἄφθονα*). Voir Post. 83 sq. et Agr. 27—48 par exemple. Le même vocabulaire se retrouve chez Clément d'Alexandrie: Str. V 52, Paed. II 102,2 et III 53.

⁶ Agr. 34: le troupeau (sc. des sens) se révolte, par suite de *κόρος*, parce que le berger (sc. l'intellect) a été nonchalant et paresseux (*ὕπνιος καὶ ράθυμος ἔχειν*); le *κόρος* vient de la négligence et de la paresse du berger (§ 39: *ἔξ ἀμε-*

Philon que *κόρος* pouvait se trouver d'une façon privilégiée dans le contexte de souvenirs platoniciens, notamment dans le contexte du festin des âmes, selon le mythe du *Phèdre* 247–248: une fois au moins, dans le traité *Quel est l'héritier des biens divins* (§ 240), parlant des âmes qui descendant dans les corps après avoir vécu dans l'éther le plus pur, Philon attribue leur mouvement vers le bas à l'impossibilité où elles ont été de «supporter le *κόρος* des biens divins». L'idée d'une *impuissance* des âmes autres que celles des dieux, pour suivre le cortège qui monte au festin de la contemplation céleste, est bien dans le texte de Platon, ainsi que la notion d'une descente des âmes, par suite de leur impuissance (248a: *γλυχόμεναι μὲν . . . ἀδυνατοῦσαι δὲ ὑποβρυχίαι . . .*); mais il semble que, entre Platon et Philon (nous manquons tout à fait de textes pour cette longue période), la tradition platonicienne ait durci la notion d'impuissance en une notion de *faute* des âmes; d'autre part, l'insistance sur le thème du festin et de la nourriture (l'aile de l'âme est «nourrie», *τρεφόμενον*, «irriguée», *ἀρδόμενον*, par la vision de ce qui est au-delà de la voûte du ciel, dans la Plaine de Vérité) a pu permettre l'introduction du thème de la «satiété», *κόρος*¹. Mais en quel sens faut-il prendre ce mot, dans ce texte de Philon pour lequel nous

λειας καὶ ἔργοντας). La corrélation entre l'ivresse des sens et le relâchement de l'intellect est plusieurs fois analysée: Leg. All. II 29–30, III 111, 183. L'intellect ne fonctionne pas dans le *κόρος*: Leg. All. II 69 etc. Certains textes rappellent l'image du cocher de l'âme (*Phèdre* 247e) fourniissant à ses deux chevaux le nectar et l'ambroisie: Philon présente un état de *κόρος* des «parties bestiales», donc un état d'insatiabilité et de révolte venant d'un excès de nourriture, comme résultant d'un manque d'attention et d'une négligence de l'intellect. Que *κόρος* puisse, à l'époque de Philon, recouvrir à la fois la notion d'un excès (*ὕβρις*) et celle d'un engourdissement (*ὕπνος*) nous est attesté par un exemple biblique: Aquila (II ème siècle ap. J. C.) utilise le mot *κόρος* pour traduire le fameux *tardemah* hébreu, cette sorte de *torpeur* que Dieu fait tomber parfois sur les hommes, notion que les Septante traduisaient habituellement par *ἔκστασις* (le fait que l'homme ne se possède plus), et qu'un autre traducteur post-septantiste, Symmaque, rend une fois par le vieux nom poétique de l'ivresse, *κάρος* (la torpeur de celui dont la tête devient lourde) (voir les diverses traductions pour Gen. II 21 et XV 12). On peut dire que chez Philon *κόρος* vaut à la fois pour les deux versants de l'ivresse (de la griserie): l'*excitation* et la *torpeur*.

¹ Ce texte de Philon en effet atteste pour la première fois l'usage de *κόρος* avec, comme complément d'objet, des «biens» qui sont certainement ceux de la contemplation; nous évoquions ci-dessus (p. 378, n. 6) la possibilité d'un *κόρος* tout différent: celui des «parties bestiales» de l'âme nourries sans mesure de nectar et d'ambroisie.

n'avons aucun parallèle¹? Les âmes sont-elles tombées dans l'excitation insolente, pour n'avoir pas supporté l'ivresse du festin des dieux? S'agit-il d'une faute d'*ὑβρις*²? Ou bien, au contraire, ont-elles succombé à l'engourdissement consécutif au «rassasissement» des biens divins? Nous retrouverions alors, avec un mot nouveau, le thème platonicien que Philon reprend si souvent: l'âme en contact avec le corps éprouve comme un *vertige*, une *ivresse*; elle vit ici-bas comme dans un *songe*, un *sommeil*, une *mort*, dans l'*oubli* de la vie véritable³. On peut encore proposer une troisième interprétation des mots «ne pas pouvoir supporter le *κόρος* des biens divins»: comme plus tard chez Plotin, nous aurions déjà l'idée que les âmes autres que celles des dieux sont incapables de supporter sans ivresse la «plénitude»: elles ne peuvent pas *se remplir* des biens qui leurs sont proposés et, énivrées, elles tombent⁴. Quel que soit le sens précis que nous

¹ Nous avons deux ou trois textes parallèles pour le thème des âmes qui «montent» ou qui «descendent», avec une terminologie évoquant l'odyssée eschatologique des âmes selon Platon (voir Gig. 12 sq. et Somn. I 138–142) mais rien ne nomme la raison de leur «descentes» comme ici. On sait que dans le texte du Phèdre, si l'âme descend «gorgée d'oubli et de vice, alourdie» (*λήθης τε καὶ κακίας πλησθεῖσα βαρυτῆς*), perdant ses ailes, cela est présenté seulement comme un «mauvais sort», *καὶ τινὶ συντυχίᾳ χοησαμένη* (248 c).

² Le seul autre exemple que nous connaissons de l'expression «ne pas pouvoir supporter le *κόρος*» possède ce sens dans le livre d'Esther 8,13, à propos d'hommes comblés d'honneurs et ensuite révoltés contre leurs bienfaiteurs, il est dit qu'ils «n'ont pas pu supporter leur *κόρος*», c'est-à-dire l'ivresse orgueilleuse du succès (voir, quelques lignes plus loin, *ὑπερηφανία* pour traduire la même idée).

³ Voir Phèdre 248 c, Phédon 79 c, Timée 52 c, par exemple, et, pour un développement tardif de ce thème: Maxime de Tyr, XVI 1 (la vie ici-bas est un songe, l'âme est enfouie dans le corps «sous l'effet d'une ivresse et d'un rassasissement», *ὑπὸ κάρον καὶ πλησμονῆς*).

⁴ Pour le sens de *κόρος*-plénitude, chez Plotin, voir p. 400 s. Il est certain, au moins en deux ou trois textes, que Philon peut utiliser l'image du rassasissement au sens de la plénitude, sans nuance péjorative. Ainsi (en Somn. I 48) distingue-t-il trois degrés de participation à la vertu, sous les trois images exprimées par les verbes «humér», «goûter», «se remplir» (*ἐμπίπλασθαι*) et (Somn. II 149) pense-t-il qu'être empêché de se «rassasier» (*κορεσθῆναι*), lorsqu'on a commencé à «goûter», est une chose bien pénible. Etre empêché de se nourrir «à satiété» de la manne (*εἰς κάρον τραφῆναι*), une fois qu'on y a «goûté», ce serait comme si, après avoir «touché» à la science, on n'y «persistait» pas (*ἔπιμεναι*) (Sacr. 85). Il y a donc, pour lui, un degré suprême de participation au bien qui s'appelleraît la plénitude: «se remplir à satiété». Mais il sait aussi que ce degré suprême, l'homme ne peut l'atteindre sans tomber dans l'orgueil (voir le très beau passage de Post. 145 que nous citons plus loin).

donnions à cette phrase, elle atteste clairement, avant Origène, l'existence d'une tradition exégétique du *Phèdre* 247–248 selon laquelle la chute des âmes dans les «eaux» de la matière venait d'une sorte de «satiété», d'impuissance à supporter une «plénitude» au festin d'immortalité. Mais chez Philon, à la différence de ce que nous sommes certains de trouver chez Origène, il s'agit d'une déficience congénitale des âmes, non pas d'une faute de leur volonté libre. Il est en cela fidèle à la tradition platonicienne; il n'annonce pas la doctrine origénienne¹.

On trouve d'autre part chez Philon la mention d'une faute par suite de *κόρος* sur le registre de deux récits mythiques: d'une part, les animaux qui vivaient jadis tous unis dans la concorde perdirent ce bonheur primitif lorsqu'ils se révoltèrent «pour s'être gorgés» (*κορεσθέντα*) des biens dont ils disposaient en abondance²; nous avons ici l'amorce d'un thème qui persistera dans la tradition chrétienne: la révolte des «Fils de Dieu», transposition du thème grec de la chute des démons insolents, pour lequel le motif de *κόρος* sera souvent associé aux mots habituels *ὕβρις*, *ὕβριζειν*³; d'autre part, Adam dans le Paradis (le Paradis est un lieu de «délices», *ταχύτης*: les conditions sont réunies, comme dans

¹ Cette affirmation serait à discuter. Pour l'affirmation platonicienne d'une impuissance congénitale des âmes, sans mention d'une «faute», voir des textes comme celui de Porphyre, *De abstinentia* I 30: nous sommes liés au sensible à cause de notre faiblesse pour être continuellement avec l'intelligible. Le commentaire d'Hermias sur le *Phèdre* ne mentionne pas davantage une faute: la *συντυχία* de 248 c devient peut-être un démon, selon une tendance à «mythiser» («Mythisierung», selon l'étude de A. Bielmeier, *Die neuplatonische Phaidrosinterpretation*, Paderborn, 1930, p. 70–73), mais cela ne correspond pas à la notion chrétienne, si forte chez Origène, d'une faute de l'âme libre, capable de dire «oui» ou «non» à quelque chose qu'elle peut décider de choisir. Il faut noter cependant que Philon emploie le mot *βαρύδαιμονία* avec une valeur morale: c'est une faute de l'âme.

² Conf. 7 (la légende des animaux vient à propos des «fils des hommes» dispersés, selon Gen. XI, 1–9).

³ Il faudrait reprendre tout ce dossier, depuis les récits de la Théogonie d'Hésiode, avec les transpositions successives (Empédoce. Cf. Diels, fr. 115), et la jonction avec le thème biblique de la descente des Fils de Dieu vers les filles des hommes, selon Genèse VI 1–4, ou de tel autre récit biblique d'une «chute». Ainsi la «chute» de Lucifer (Is. XIV 12–15); celle du Prince de Tyr (Ez. XXVIII). On trouve chez Eusèbe de Césarée (voir par exemple P. E. XVI 4–7) un étonnant vocabulaire pour exprimer la folie, l'excitation, la violence qui fit déchoir le premier ange. Voir aussi P. Humbert, *Démesure et chute* dans l'A. T., Hommage à W. Vischer, 1960.

l'Age d'or des Grecs, pour qu'il y ait *κόρος*¹), succomba peut-être par suite d'un *κόρος*: Philon explique en effet qu'après la faute, pour tempérer le châtiment, Dieu décida que désormais la nourriture dépendrait du travail, afin d'éviter le recommencement de ces maux terribles que sont l'oisiveté et le rassasissement, *ἀγύλα* et *κόρος*². Nous retrouverons la mention d'une faute par suite de *κόρος*, sur les deux registres de la chute des anges et de la faute d'Adam, dans l'œuvre même d'Origène et chez Basile de Césarée³. Mais il ne s'agit là que de l'application banale de la vieille notion grecque: *κόρος-ὕβρις*, lorsqu'il s'agit de Satan; *κόρος-ὕπνος*, lorsqu'il s'agit d'Adam. Dans l'un et l'autre cas, des êtres primitivement «heureux» ont abusé des nourritures qu'ils avaient en abondance (même si ces nourritures s'appellent des «biens», il reste quelque chose de sensuel dans la glotonnerie de ceux qui s'en «rassasient»); il s'agit bien d'une «satiété», avec ses conséquences de démesure ou d'engourdissement; mais non pas, semble-t-il, d'une satiété de la contemplation, avec l'idée

¹ Le mot qui fait la jonction entre le récit biblique et les textes traditionnels grecs est *ἀρθοντία*: dans le Paradis, tout était donné à l'homme «en abondance» sans qu'il ait à travailler; de même dans l'Age d'or; de même aussi au festin de la Plaine de Vérité auquel les âmes sont conviées selon le récit du Phèdre; Philon et certains Pères ont interprété la fameuse formule de 247 a «*φθόνος γὰρ ἐξωθεὸν χροῦ λοταρεῖ*» comme indiquant l'*ἀρθοντία* des flots de science qui s'écoulent de Dieu (Philon, Quod omn. 13). Le problème est bien celui-ci, chez les Grecs comme chez les Chrétiens: la créature peut-elle (ou sait-elle) recevoir la plénitude de ces dons abondants qui s'écoulent sans cesse de la source divine?

² Opif. 169. Il n'y a pas danger de *κόρος* lorsque l'homme se trouve dans une situation difficile, dans la «pénurie», au lieu de se trouver face à «l'abondance» et aux «délices» (*τρυψί*) (voir notre étude «La prise de conscience de la «nudité» d'Adam», Studia Patristica VII, (TU 92), Berlin, 1966, p. 486—495).

³ Satan a «perdu ses ailes» parce qu'il s'est «gorgé des biens», *κορεθεὶς τῶν ἀγαθῶν*, C. Celsum VI 44 ed. Koetschau p. 115,18 (noter la jonction entre le mythe du Phèdre et le récit de Ezéchiel 28,12—13). Pour Basile voir plus loin. Le thème d'Adam endormi énivré, selon Origène, mérite d'être étudié à part: on reconstitue cette notion, en prenant appui sur le parallèle établi par Origène entre la situation d'Adam dans le Paradis et celle de Poros dans le jardin de Zeus, énivré de nectar, endormi (Banquet 203 b: *μεθυσθεὶς τοῦ νέκταρος . . . βεβαρημένος εἰδένει*) (C. Celsum IV 39 et Eusèbe, P. E. XII 11). Le point commun aux deux récits, si j'interprète correctement la pensée d'Origène, est qu'il y eut, dans les deux cas, «tromperie» exercée aux dépens d'un homme intelligent dont le tort fut de s'être laissé *endormir*; la tromperie est due à un personnage représentant la matière (le serpent, lorsqu'il s'agit d'Adam; Pénia, lorsqu'il s'agit de Poros). Le motif de la faute d'Adam serait donc de s'être «gorgé», jusqu'à cette forme de l'ivresse qui alourdit et endort.

associée que l'âme, rassasiée, «se détourne» de ce qu'elle ne peut plus supporter. Nous n'avons rien trouvé qui annonce le thème dénoncé comme «origéniste». En tous cas, aucune notion élaborée d'un seuil de satiété; seulement des notions morales associées à l'image du rassasiement: l'orgueil, l'insolence, la révolte, ou encore la paresse, l'engourdissement, l'ivresse. Ces notions morales ont pris une particulière importance chez Philon, toujours pessimiste lorsqu'il s'agit des créatures: il sait que celles-ci ne sont même pas capables de recevoir dans leur plénitude les grâces divines, qu'elles doivent respecter les lois de sobriété et d'humilité, que Dieu lui-même, dans sa bonté, mesure l'octroi de ses grâces, sachant «que l'être créé est incapable d'en supporter le flot abondant» sans tomber dans ces fautes d'ivresse insolente¹. Philon, cependant, connaît le remède capable d'éviter le *κόρος*, du point de vue de l'homme: il faut garder en soi le désir toujours renouvelé de Dieu, il faut être insatiable². On voit déjà chez lui l'amorce du thème spirituel si important chez les Chrétiens, celui qui, précisément, s'oppose au *κόρος*, le thème de l'ἀκόρεστον³.

Avant d'entreprendre la deuxième partie de notre enquête, dont le but est de retrouver l'ensemble des termes employés par Origène pour nommer le motif de la chute des âmes, il est nécessaire d'ajouter une précision sur le sens de *κόρος* dans l'expression *κόρον λαβεῖν*, celle que nous lisons dans les anathématismes. En réalité, nous n'avons pas trouvé cette expression dans les multiples emplois de *κόρος* avant Origène, mais seule-

¹ Post. 145.

² C'est le thème biblique de la soif insatiable: Sirac. 24,19–21 («ceux qui me mangent auront encore faim, ceux qui me boivent auront encore soif»). Philon sait que la réjouissance promise dans les vignes du Seigneur doit être une joie *sans satiété* (*ἀκόρεστος εὐφορίην*, Quod deus 154, cf. Somn. I 50, Gig. 31). Je ne vois rien de plus proche à signaler, dans le texte du Phèdre, que ce qui est dit de la nourriture du dieu: il se nourrit d'intellection et de science «sans mélange», *διχήρατος* (ou: qui ne subit aucun dommage?) (247 d). Philon dit encore que l'âme placée devant les spectacles célestes éprouve à ce festin un plaisir toujours renouvelé: elle garde «une grande insatiabilité de contemplation», *πολλὴν ἀπληστίαν . . . τοῦ θεωρεῖν*. (Opif. 54). Le texte le plus important est De plant. 23–25.

³ Les formules de Philon se retrouvent textuellement chez Clément d'Alexandrie. Voir notamment Str. VII 13, où il est aussi question d'une «contemplation sans satiété», *ἀκόρεστος θέα*. Voir le texte de Basile analysé à la fin de cet article. Origène exprimera le même thème spirituel avec un vocabulaire différent, que nous signalerons. Une étude du thème de l'*ἀκόρεστον* devra tenir compte de l'emploi des mots *ἀπληστος-ἀπληστία* et *ἀπανστος*.

ment l'expression analogue *κόρον ἔχειν*, qui signifie que même les meilleures choses, à la longue, «procurent la satiété», «lassent». Le sens de *κόρον λαβεῖν* est identique: l'image du rassasiement est atténuée; reste l'idée d'une *lassitude*, d'une perte du désir de manger encore. Ceci est très important à préciser, d'autant que le premier exemple que nous en connaissons est justement fourni par Origène lui-même: dans le passage du *Traité de la Prière* consacré à démontrer que Dieu, parfois, laisse le mal se développer afin que l'âme en prenne le dégoût et se convertisse, il donne l'exemple de ce que fit Dieu à l'égard du peuple réclamant de la viande: il leur permit d'en manger autant qu'ils en voudraient car, tant qu'ils n'auraient pas l'objet de leur désir, «ils ne pourraient pas en prendre satiété et cesser d'éprouver ce désir», *κόρον οὐκ ἡδύναστο αὐτῶν λαβεῖν οὐδὲ παύσασθαι τοῦ πάθους*¹. *Κόρον λαβεῖν* est donc explicité par le verbe *παύσασθαι*: «avoir satisfaction» de quelque chose a pour conséquence «cesser» de désirer ce que l'on a ainsi «à satiété», sans d'ailleurs qu'il soit nécessaire d'ajouter l'idée d'un *dégoût* associé à cette satisfaction. Ici, dans ce texte, la notion de dégoût est ajoutée, car il s'agit d'une expérience du *mal*, mais on peut voir par un texte d'Athanase qu'il n'en est pas toujours ainsi: cet auteur fait un récit de l'athéisme, en disant que les hommes, après avoir inventé les premières formes de la superstition, ne s'en sont pas contentés (*κόρον οὐ λαμβάνοντες*) mais ont continué à se gorger toujours de nouvelles erreurs, persistant et progressant dans la honte, étendant toujours plus leur impiété². Cet emploi de *κόρον λαμβάνειν* est remarquable pour nous montrer qu'il s'agit d'un arrêt du mouvement qui pousserait à continuer: exactement ce que nous trouverons, avec d'autres mots, dans la doctrine d'Origène de la chute des âmes.

Un des textes d'Origène les plus importants sur l'origine du mal se trouve dans le Livre VI du *Contre Celso*, dans les chapitres

¹ De orat. 29,14 ed. Koetschau p. 389,2. Bien noter que *κόρον λαβεῖν* s'oppose à «désirer» (I.1: *τὰ ἐπιθυμούμενα*).

² C. Gentes 8. Voir aussi Apol. pour sa fuite 4: les persécuteurs «se sont-ils sentis rassasiés et désormais tenus tranquilles?» (*κόρον ἔχοντι καὶ . . . ηρέμησαν*): *κόρον ἔχειν* indique ici aussi l'arrêt d'une activité, une mise au repos. Ces deux textes, qui n'ont aucun rapport avec un problème théologique, sont très précieux pour fixer le sens qu'avait l'expression *κόρον λαβεῖν* au cours du IVème siècle. Aucune confusion n'était possible: c'est un sens très affaibli, l'équivalent d'un verbe comme «cesser».

43 et suivants. Origène annonce lui-même qu'il va traiter de ce sujet (*περὶ τῆς κακίας, πολὺν ἔσχεν ἀρχὴν καὶ γένεσιν*), identique à ses yeux à la doctrine de la chute du Diable (ό περὶ τοῦ πονηροῦ καὶ ἐκπεσόντος τῶν οὐρανῶν λόγος). En quelques lignes très précises, il révèle les notions fondamentales de sa doctrine du mal: l'origine du mal, c'est que certains êtres ont perdu leurs ailes¹, ce qui veut dire qu'ils ont cessé de participer au bien. On pourrait croire qu'Origène développerait alors le thème de la chute de Satan: il n'en est rien. Il passe aussitôt à une explication très générale de la cessation de la participation au bien, dont nous sommes sûrs qu'elle vaut dans son esprit sur tous les registres d'une faute primitive: ce qu'il explique ici, nous le trouvons ailleurs expliqué pour la chute des âmes préexistantes (dans le *Traité des Principes*), ailleurs encore pour la faute d'Adam dans le Paradis: les premières créatures spirituelles, les anges, Adam dans le Paradis, ne sont que trois cas analogues², des variétés d'une

¹ Le verbe *πτεροցούειν* rattache explicitement cette page sur l'origine du mal, elle-même liée à la chute du premier ange, à la mythologie du Phèdre (246c: l'âme bien pourvue d'ailes peut cheminer dans les airs; celle qui a perdu les ailes, *πτεροցούσασα*, est entraînée jusqu'à ce qu'elle se soit saisie de quelque chose de solide) (trad. L. Robin). L'image avait déjà été employée par Tatien (Or. 20,1), pour lequel le motif de notre pente vers le sensible était appelé un manque de force, une *ἀτονία*, et qui identifie l'aile à l'Esprit que l'homme perd par la faute. L'identification de «ce qui fait monter» l'âme aux vertus est déjà chez Philon (J. Daniélou, La colombe et la ténèbre..., op. cit. p. 375 n. 2, p. 397, attribue cette identification, reprise par Grégoire de Nysse, au néoplatonisme: elle est antérieure): Quis heres 241, Cher. 47 etc. Il est très remarquable qu'Origène, employant cette terminologie imagée, ait éprouvé le besoin d'apporter un texte biblique à titre de témoignage: Prov. 23,5. Voir aussi Cohort. ad Gentiles 32. L'image de la perte des ailes pour nommer l'état de l'âme qui penche vers la matière était également employée par les Gnostiques, si l'on en croit le témoignage de Plotin, II 9,4.

² Ceci aurait besoin d'une démonstration. Qu'il me suffise de rappeler le goût d'Origène pour situer les problèmes de liberté et de faute, de chute, sur le plan général de «la nature spirituelle» et les textes au cours desquels il passe, tout naturellement, d'un registre mythique au plan philosophique. Ainsi, pour nous borner à un exemple, assimile-t-il «l'expulsion d'Adam hors du Paradis» à «la descente de l'âme dans le corps, selon le mythe du Phèdre; dans ce texte (C. Celsum IV 40, qui fait suite à la comparaison Adam-Poros) la pointe de l'argumentation est d'affirmer la supériorité de Moïse sur Platon mais nous en retiendrons aussi que la scène biblique choisie par Origène pour surpasser le mythe platonicien, scène qui raconte l'expulsion d'Adam du Paradis et comment Dieu alors lui donna les tuniques de peau fabriquées à cause de la désobéissance», avait à ses yeux un contenu analogue à la descente de l'âme dans le corps. Les trois cas (âmes, anges, Adam) s'enchaînent aussi chez Tatien (20,1).

même espèce qui s'appelle «la nature spirituelle», unique et identique chez tous. Ce sont tous (et cela suffit à les définir pour leur vie «essentielle») (1) des créatures (*γενητά*); (2) capables de participer au logos divin (*λογικά*); (3) libres (*αὐτεξόνσια*). Le problème commun, sur les trois registres, est que ces créatures avaient d'abord été placées «dans la bénédiction»¹, qu'elles auraient pu y rester, qu'elles en sont «tombées»: le terme même de «chute» (*πτίτειν* et ses composés, ou d'autres verbes indiquant un mouvement d'éloignement et de descente²) est commun à tous les divers «registres» mythiques (les divers «logoi»), dont on peut donner une explication philosophique commune, celle que nous avons ici. Il faut d'ailleurs noter que, même en ce texte qui est consacré en principe à la chute de Satan, Origène emploie des tours de phrases très vagues («certains», «celui qui participe»), si bien que son raisonnement vaut pour tous les cas.

Il oppose «ce qui est bon substantiellement», *τὸ οὐσιωδῶς ἀγαθόν*, (c'est Dieu) à «ce qui est bon d'une façon accidentelle et acquise» (c'est le cas de la créature)³: le «bien» vient à la créature selon la participation qu'elle prend au bien-en-soi; ce bien ne lui

¹ La notion de «vie bienheureuse», *μακαρίστης*, semble recouvrir pour Origène, d'une façon générale, la vie de la nature spirituelle lorsqu'elle est unie à Dieu: la vie primitive des âmes préexistantes avant la chute, qui se confond avec la vie primitive des natures angéliques avant leur chute, avec la vie paradisiaque d'Adam avant la faute, et qui est aussi la vie espérée après ce monde-ci. Il aurait fallu «rester» dans la bénédiction initiale (Com. in Jo I 20 (22), 123 p. 125,12–14). La notion de «bénédiction» se précise parfois en «la contemplation du Beau dans le lieu supra-céleste», selon l'espoir qu'avaient (dit Origène, C. Celsum III 80) Pythagore et Platon. Il existe un seul problème, celui de la vie «essentielle» des âmes, notre vie «principale» (ou «première»: *προταγορικὴν*), définie comme une union à Dieu (*κοινωνία*), qui est la contemplation (C. Celsum III 56 p. 251,13–15).

² Les composés avec *ἀπό* ou *κατά* ou *ἐκ*, ces trois prépositions décrivant l'origine du mal comme un éloignement de Dieu, une descente d'en haut (voir par exemple Com. in Jo. XIX 20 (5), 130 p. 321,17–18: *καταλειπόντειν τὰ κρείττονα* et XX 22 (20), 182 p. 355,5: *ἀποπεπτωκάς τῶν κρείττονων*) ou une sortie hors de la bénédiction initiale: voir comment Origène interprète dans le sens de la chute la simple préposition *ἐξ* qu'il lit en Gen. 3,22: *εἰς ἐξ ὑμῶν* ceci signifiant: *ἔκτεσόντα τῆς μακαρίστης* (Com. in Jo. XXXII 18 (11), 233). Un des verbes importants à signaler est *κυνῆσαι*, tel qu'Origène le commente lorsqu'il le lit en Gen. XI 2: C. Celsum V 30, p. 31–32.

³ Cette terminologie est fréquente chez Origène. Voir Com. in Jo. II 18, 124 p. 75,8–9 (*μη̄ οὐσιωδῶς . . . ὡς ἀχώστον συμβεβηκός*), De princ. I 8,3 (*naturaliter, substantialiter . . . ex assumptione . . .*). Les «ailes» de l'âme sont ainsi ce qui peut s'ajouter (pousser) ou se perdre (tomber).

fera pas défaut tant qu'elle prendra part; s'il lui manque un jour, ce sera par sa propre faute. Le métaphore de la nourriture se mêle à l'expression abstraite: «prendre part», c'est «se nourrir»¹. Origène emploie même, pour cette nourriture, les termes les plus chrétiens («le pain vivant», «la boisson véritable»). Il est fondamental pour lui, quelle que soit l'expression littéraire qu'il utilise, d'affirmer que la «conservation» de la vie d'une créature (sa *τήρησις*²) est au prix de son alimentation. Ce qui peut faire arrêter cette vie (il s'agit, bien entendu, de la vie véritable, celle de l'être *λογικός*) c'est un arrêt dans son alimentation, arrêt dont il sera lui-même «responsable» (*παρὰ τὴν ἀλτίαν*)³. Un mot va nous donner très précisément le motif qu'Origène imagine à cet arrêt (le motif de la faute, par conséquent): le bien manquera «si l'on est négligent (nonchalant, paresseux: *ράθυμησαντος*) à prendre part». Voilà la seule explication possible de la «perte des ailes»: les ailes ont besoin de nourriture pour pousser⁴; la créature peut et doit s'alimenter à la source de tout bien; elle perdra cette participation et «tombera» si elle commet la faute

¹ La métaphore de la nourriture des ailes de l'âme vient du Phèdre: Origène est fidèle au contexte du mythe de la chute des âmes. Voir dans le texte du Phèdre 248e: *τούτοις* (sc. le divin, le beau, le sage, le bon) *τρέπεται τε καὶ αὐξεται . . . τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς πτέρωμα*; 247d: *τρεφομένη* et: *θεωροῦσα τάληθῆ τρέπεται καὶ εἰ παθεῖ*; 247e: *θεασαμένη καὶ ἐσταθεῖσα*; 248b—c: (τ . . . νόμη) . . . *τούτῳ τρέπεται*. Origène est, dans le texte que nous analysons ici, C. Celsum VI 44, p. 114,24, un témoin ancien de la variante *ἀρδεται* pour *αὐξεται* pour le texte du Phèdre, si l'on doit voir ici une allusion à Phèdre 248e. Certains passages du commentaire d'Hermias et de Proclus connaissent cette leçon, à cet endroit. Le verbe *ἀρδεσθαι* de toutes manières se lit en Phèdre 251b et c. Il signifie «être irrigué», ou «recevoir de la vitalité» (voir la traduction et la note de L. Robin). Philon utilise cette métaphore de l'irrigation mais plus souvent celle de la nourriture. Voir par exemple Opif. 158, Leg. All. I 97—98, Fug. 137 sq., Leg. All. I 64 etc. . . Pour Origène la nourriture de l'âme est la nourriture eucharistique, le pain et le vin, participation au Verbe de Dieu. Pour les néoplatoniciens, reprenant un thème des Oracles Chaldaïques, ce sont les trois vertus qui nourrissent l'âme (foi, vérité, amour, correspondant au bon, au sage et au beau de Phèdre 246 d) (Proclus, Sur le Ier Alcibiade, ed. Cousin p. 356,20 sq.). L'irrigation et la nourriture de l'âme ont pour résultat sa «croissance»: *αὐξεται*. Tout ce vocabulaire est à interpréter sur le registre de la vie spirituelle chez Origène.

² C. Celsum VI 44 p. 114,21. Peut-être ce terme provient-il de la doctrine de l'*οἰκείωσις*, d'origine stoïcienne. Chaque être s'approprie la nourriture qui assure sa vie. On retrouvera *τήρησις* dans la doctrine de la *κυρτήρησις*.

³ Ibid. p. 114,22. Même emploi de *παρὰ* suivi d'un accusatif, au sens de «du fait de», en De orat. 29,13 p. 388,1 (*παρὰ τὴν λόιαν ἀλτίαν*).

⁴ Voir les références données dans la note 1.

de «nonchalance», *ἀνθνμία*. Quelques pages plus loin, le même thème est repris avec un autre mot, de sens très voisin: c'est «par négligence du beau», *δι' ἀμέλειαν τοῦ καλοῦ*, que certaines créatures se précipitent vers le mal¹.

Cette page du *Contre Celso* correspond à une doctrine constante d'Origène, que nous trouvons souvent rappelée, ne serait-ce que par un mot. En voici quelques exemples: *Com. in Jo.* XIII 33, les âmes ont besoin de l'alimentation qui est la contemplation de Dieu; elles ne sont pas «sans besoin» (*ἀνενδεεῖς*); si elles cessent de s'alimenter, elles perdent, non pas leur existence puisqu'elles sont déjà créées, mais la qualité de leur être, leur degré de participation aux attributs divins, à la Vie essentielle et véritable². Les âmes se classent, selon Origène, en «races», en «degrés», selon leur participation au logos divin: il s'agit de «plus» ou de «moins» dans leur alimentation³. Adam était placé dans le Paradis des délices⁴ avec des consignes concernant son alimentation: il serait resté immortel, s'il avait mangé de tout arbre du Paradis, comme on le lui avait ordonné, et s'il s'était abstenu de l'arbre interdit⁵. L'immortalité promise à Adam, on le voit bien par ce texte, est

¹ C. Celsum VI 45 p. 116,8.

² ed. Preuschen p. 257—258.

³ Un exemple de la difficulté d'interprétation des textes d'Origène: chaque fois qu'il est question des «races» ou des «degrés» de participation des âmes au logos divin s'agit-il de paliers dans la vie spirituelle d'une âme, qui «monte» ou qui «descend», ou bien s'agit-il d'états atteints par diverses âmes, dans leur existence eschatologique, fixées plus ou moins haut, dans des corps plus ou moins lourds, selon le degré d'éloignement de leur chute loin de Dieu? Pour ces degrés dans la montée ou la descente, voir *De orat.* 29,13. Pour l'accusation portée contre Origène d'avoir enseigné des «classes» d'âmes, des *βαθμοί*, voir la dernière phrase du ch. III du *Traité de la nature de l'homme* de Némésius d'Emèse (ed. Matthaei p. 144).

⁴ Signalons une curieuse erreur typographique de l'ed. Preuschen, p. 260,1: *τὸν παράδεισον τῆς τροφῆς*, au lieu de *τροφῆς*: noter aussi la facilité avec laquelle Origène passe au développement sur Adam.

⁵ «serait resté immortel», *ἀθάρατος δὲ ἔμεινεν οὐ ἄνθρωπος* (p. 260,2). Il était plus traditionnel de dire que l'homme *aurait acquis* l'immortalité s'il avait persisté dans son alimentation à l'arbre de Vie, car il n'était initialement ni mortel ni immortel, mais capable d'acquérir l'immortalité ou de tomber dans la corruptibilité (voir Théophile d'Antioche II 27). Origène lui-même enseigne que les démons, par exemple, sont tombés «du chemin qui va vers le bien» (*ἀποκεσύτες τῆς ἐπὶ τῷ ἀγαθῷ ὁδοῦ*, C. Celsum VII 69 p. 218,17), ce qui prouve bien que pour lui l'état initial n'était pas une perfection définitivement acquise mais un progrès perpétuel (voir J. Daniélou, *Message évangélique et culture hellénistique*, p. 383: l'être créé est «un dieu en perpétuel devenir»).

l'immortalité au terme d'un festin, l'immortalité donnée par la nourriture prise à l'arbre de vie. La faute d'Adam, comme toute faute, est une faute concernant sa nourriture. *C. Celsum* V 30: Origène traite de manière allégorique le récit biblique de la dispersion des peuples à partir de l'Orient (*Genèse* 11); il y voit la figure de la dispersion des âmes dans le monde matériel, loin de Dieu, par suite de leur «mouvement» fautif. Ces peuples dispersés arrivent à un lieu dont le nom symbolique signifie «grincement des dents»: nom bien adapté, dit Origène, car ces âmes «ont perdu ce par quoi elles sont nourries» (*ἀπολλύναι αὐτοὺς τὰ δι’ ἀν τρέφονται*). Le motif de leur faute fut donc la perte de leur nourriture, l'arrêt de leur alimentation, encore une fois¹.

La métaphore de la nourriture des âmes par la contemplation fait place le plus souvent, dans la langue d'Origène, à des expressions plus abstraites: s'alimenter, c'est «se tourner» vers Dieu; ne pas s'alimenter, s'est «se détourner» de Dieu. Le vocabulaire le plus fréquent est celui de la «tension» du regard de l'âme vers Dieu, la motif de la faute étant alors un relâchement de cette tension, une inattention. Quelques textes: *Com. in Jo.* II 2,18: Si le Fils, à la différence des créatures, prend une part entière à la divinité du Père, c'est parce qu'il «persiste sans aucune interruption dans la contemplation de la profondeur paternelle», *παρέμενε τῇ ἀδιαλείπτῳ θέᾳ τοῦ πατρικοῦ βάθους*². *Com. in Matth.* XI 17: Si les âmes se classent en différentes «races», c'est selon qu'elles tendent ou qu'elles relâchent la fine pointe de leur volonté (*ἐπιτείνει τὴν προσίρεστν, . . . ἔργημά καὶ ἀμέλεια*³). Si l'on «tombe», si l'on «descend», c'est par suite d'une inattention, d'une ignorance du beau (*C. Celsum* VII 69: *παρ’ ἰδίαν ἀπροσεξίαν, ἄγνοια τῶν καλῶν*)⁴. La règle générale, c'est qu'il faut «garder» (*τηρεῖν*) la loi de Dieu, sa Parole: toute faute est un manque d'attention à cette loi, une «fatigue» dans l'attention (*ὅτε δέ τις καμὼν ἐν τῇ προσοχῇ καὶ τηρήσει*), mais cette fatigue est coupable: elle est assimilée à l'inattention (*καμὼν . . . ἡ ἀπροσεκτήσας περὶ τὸ τηρεῖν*) (*Com. in Jo.* XX

¹ *C. Celsum* V 30 p. 31,24.

² ed. Preuschen p. 55,7.

³ ed. Klostermann-E. Benz p. 62,19. Voir notre Origène et la fonction révélatrice du Verbe incarné, Paris, 1958, p. 265.

⁴ p. 218,12. Voir aussi *De orat.* 29,13 p. 388,2–3: *ἡτοι . . . κατ’ ἐπανάβασιν . . . <ἢ> καταβάνοντας διαφόρως ἐξ ἀπροσεξίας . . .*

39 (31)¹. Le terme même de «négligence» (*ἀμέλεια*, *ἀμελεῖν*) est celui qui résume le mieux le seul motif qu'Origène puisse imaginer à la chute des âmes, avec ses variantes de «paresse» (*δαθυμία*), d'«inaction» (*ἀργύλα*, *ἀργεῖν*)², d'«inattention» (*ἀπροσεξία*). Si nous devons rencontrer, dans l'œuvre d'Origène, cette autre expression du motif de la chute, *χόρον λαβεῖν τῆς θεωρίας*, il ne fait aucun doute que ce sera encore avec un sens voisin: s'arrêter de contempler par suite de lassitude dans l'effort, de paresse ou de négligence, comme quelqu'un qui, au festin de la contemplation, perdrait le goût de manger encore³.

Connaissant maintenant l'ensemble des cinq ou six mots grecs les plus typiques de la conception origénienne de la faute des âmes, nous pouvons aborder la lecture des pages du *Traité des Principes* et tenter une rétroversión approximative de certains

¹ p. 382,20. Le thème de la *fatigue* des âmes donne lieu chez Plotin à une excellente description de l'abandon progressif de l'effort mais il nous semble qu'une différence essentielle sépare la pensée d'Origène de celle de Plotin: pour Origène cette fatigue n'est qu'une forme de lassitude *coupable*, d'inattention.

² *'Aργεῖν* signifie «cesser de» (voir Com. in Jo. XXXII 21 (13), 268 p. 462, 20). C'est un mot qu'utilisera Grégoire de Nysse pour indiquer l'arrêt dans la participation au bien: Hom. in Cant. XII ed. Langerbeck p. 350,1. On trouve le thème de l'inattention dans un fragment cité par Justinien, utilisé par Koetschau dans son édition du *Traité des Principes*, en I 6,2, p. 80,15: «Par la propre faute de ceux qui ne portent pas à eux-mêmes une attention sans sommeil, surviennent plus ou moins vite les chutes . . .», *τὰν μὴ προσεχόντων ἐντοῖς ἀγρύπνως*. Rufin a traduit (si du moins la citation de Justinien nous fait connaître le texte authentique d'Origène) par des mots qui indiquent la négligence (deux verbes: *neglegant atque dissimulent*, p. 81,11) et la paresse (*desidia*, p. 81,12). Avec les quatre ou cinq mots qui reviennent dans tous ces textes, nous tournons toujours autour de la même idée.

³ La meilleure interprétation, en ce sens, du *«χόρον λαβεῖν»* est donnée par H. Cornélis, *Les fondements cosmologiques . . .* (op. cit. p. 375, n. 2) p. 90, qui parle d'*inappétence*, ou par A. Guillaumont, *Les Képhalaia Gnostica . . .* (op. cit. p. 373, n. 1) lorsqu'il traduit exactement la formule des anathématismes par «en avoir assez de» (p. 141 et 144), au lieu de parler de «satiété» (p. 142). Une traduction par «dégout» et même par «ennui» (J. Daniélou, *La colombe et la ténèbre . . .* p. 417) nous paraît encore excessive. Le terme de «satiété» (ou, en anglais, «surfeit») est couramment employé, sans qu'une étude ait encore été faite, pour en justifier le sens. On le trouve employé sans hésitation par F. Prat, *Origène*, p. XXXII (satiété du bonheur), par P. Sherwood, op. cit. p. 375, (voir n. 2), par C. Tresmontant (qui voit dans cette satiéte, comme dans la négligence, de simples «déficiences psychologiques», étrangères à la tradition biblique d'un péché moral), p. 285, 397, 409–411. R. Cadiou, *La jeunesse d'Origène*, 1936, p. 226–227, emploie une terminologie beaucoup plus juste: «Elles (les âmes préexistantes) se sont opposées à leur principe comme la faiblesse s'oppose à la force, la fatigue à la persévérence, l'inertie à l'activité . . .».

passages du latin de Rufin où semble se trouver la notion de satiété.

Le traité 9 du livre II de cet ouvrage fait un récit de la chute des âmes, pour introduire au sujet de la création du monde : les créatures raisonnables se sont toutes plus ou moins éloignées de Dieu et c'est pour les recevoir que Dieu a créé un monde divers, comme leurs chutes sont diverses. Origène rappelle d'abord, comme dans *C. Celsum* VI 44, que la qualité des âmes ne leur est pas «naturelle», qu'elle leur est donnée par Dieu. Ce qui leur est donné peut aussi leur être enlevé. Nous retrouvons là le thème des attributs «adventices» de l'âme, qui peuvent s'adjointre ou se disjoindre et faire défaut¹. Le bien sera enlevé «si le mouvement des âmes n'est pas dirigé droitement et d'une bonne façon»². Les deux adverbes *recte* et *probabiliter* correspondent peut-être (si Rufin est fidèle) à des adverbes comme *ὁρθῶς*, *καλῶς* ou *βεβαλῶς*, mais d'une façon plus générale nous devons nous rappeler le mot trouvé dans *Com. in Jo.* II 2,18, cité plus haut, *ἀδιάλειπτος*, qui indique que l'âme ne participe aux attributs divins qu'au prix d'une tension «ininterrompue» du regard (Rufin utilise ailleurs en ce sens *indesinenter* et *inseparabiliter*³). Il faut surtout noter que, ici, la participation à Dieu est acquise au prix d'un «mouvement»; mouvement vers Dieu, mouvement qui doit être «droit». La faute arrivera quand ce mouvement cessera ou se détournera. Origène rappelle encore que le Créateur a accordé aux natures spirituelles de pouvoir ainsi acquérir le bien par leur propre mouvement, volontaire et libre. C'est alors que Rufin nous donne, en une phrase, avec quatre mots latins, l'énoncé des motifs possibles de cette faute: *sed desidia et laboris taedium in servando bono et aversio ac neglegentia*

¹ Voir p. 386, n. 3. Origène emploie des composés avec ἐπί, comme ἐπιγύγνεσθαι ou ἐπισυμβάλλειν (*C. Celsum* VI 44 p. 114,19: ἐξ ἐπιγενήματος). Voir plus loin l'usage que Plotin fera, dans le même sens, de l'adjectif ἐπακτός. Le bien est, pour l'âme créée, l'objet d'une «importation».

² II 9,2 p. 165,24.

³ *indesinenter*: De princ. II 6,6 p. 145,21 et I 3,8 p. 62,9. Nous retenons de préférence, pour notre sujet, ce qui concerne la tension ininterrompue du mouvement. Il est bien certain que d'autres caractéristiques sont également affirmées, notamment cette «droiture» du mouvement, ici, à laquelle s'oppose la «déviation» du mouvement (*διαστροφή*), sa perversion. Il me semble que l'*inconvertibilitas* du Fils (II 6, 6 p. 145,21: ἀτρεπτότης?) désigne cette droiture du mouvement, qui ne se tourne ni à droite ni à gauche, et non pas une immobilité. Voir plus loin.

meliorum initium dedit recedendi a bono, «mais la nonchalance et la lassitude du travail pour garder le bien, le mouvement d'aversion et la négligence du bien furent le début de l'éloignement loin du bien». De ces quatre termes, l'un d'eux, *aversio* (grec: ἀποστροφή), décrit le fait plutôt qu'il n'en donne le motif. Les trois autres recoupent plus ou moins les mots grecs que nous avons inventoriés: *neglegentia meliorum* peut être une traduction de ἀμέλεια κρειττόνων; *desidia* et *laboris taedium* indiquent tous deux l'abandon de l'effort par paresse ou lassitude: ἀργία ou ἀρθυμψία; *laboris taedium* pourrait aussi être une traduction du tour grec κόρον λαβεῖν, au sens que nous avons précisé: «en avoir assez de», «se lasser de» faire effort pour «conserver le bien», (*τηρεῖν τὸ ἄγαθόν*, probablement). Les deux mots *desidia* et *neglegentia* sont également associés en un autre passage (I 6,2), où Origène rappelle encore une fois que la «bonté» des créatures ne leur est pas «substantielle» mais «accidentelle», qu'elle peut donc leur faire défaut (*accidere, decidere*: συμβάλειν, ἀπονυμβάλειν?)¹, ce qui arrive «si elles négligent» de prendre part aux vertus divines (sainteté, sagesse, divinité) par suite de leur paresse (*si neglegant atque dissimulent ... vitio propriae desidiae*). Paresse, négligence, lassitude dans l'effort, inattention: tels sont bien les motifs de la faute pour Origène, sans que nous trouvions une seule mention d'une véritable «satiété», au sens où il y aurait dégoût pour une nourriture trop forte. La responsabilité du κόρος, si κόρος il y a, est tout entière du côté de l'âme qui se lasse, par paresse et par négligence, par manque de vigilance dans l'effort.

Reste le fameux passage du *Traité des Principes* (I 3,8) où Rufin emploie le mot même de *satietas*, au sens même où les accusateurs d'Origène dénoncent la notion, puisqu'il est question d'une satiéte du bien: *satietas boni*. Origène vient de consacrer une dissertation à l'action continue du Père, du Fils et de l'Esprit sur les âmes (*in desinenter opus*)². La pointe de l'argumentation

¹ p. 80,13 sq. Ces deux termes grecs apparaissent dans la terminologie de Sextus Empiricus, comme chez Origène (C. Celsum VI 44 p. 114, 19–21).

² p. 62,13, sq. R. Cadiou, Introduction au système d'Origène, 1932, p. 113, s'appuie sur ce texte, à la suite de G. Bardy, Recherches sur l'Histoire du texte et des versions latines du *De principiis d'Origène*, Lille, 1923, pour dire que la formule authentique d'Origène employait κόρος comme sujet du verbe λαμβάνειν (sc. λ. τὰς ψυχάς), contrairement au tour cité par les anathématismes. Nous n'avons trouvé aucun exemple de cette construction en grec, mais plusieurs fois la construction d'un sujet gouvernant le verbe (κόρον) λαβεῖν.

dans le passage qui suit est, me semble-t-il, qu'à l'action «continue» de Dieu doit correspondre, du côté de l'homme, un accueil «continu» de cette action, ce que l'on peut appeler l'attention «sans aucune interruption», *ἀδιαλείπτως*. C'est par rapport à ce sujet central que doivent s'interpréter les lignes suivantes: «si un jour, après beaucoup de luttes, nous pouvons parvenir à la vie sainte et bienheureuse, nous devons y persister (*perdurare*: traduction probable d'un des mots les plus importants de la langue spirituelle d'Origène: *ἐπιμένειν* ou un autre composé de *μένειν*) sans que jamais ne nous saisisse la satiété de ce bien . . . Si un jour la satiété prit l'un de ceux qui furent établis dans la classe la plus élevée et parfaite . . . inévitablement il a glissé peu à peu . . . il pourra retrouver ce qu'il a perdu par sa négligence». Nous laissons de côté dans ce texte ce qui, cependant, est le thème le plus important (les degrés divers des chutes loin de Dieu), pour n'en retenir que les motifs de la chute: la «satiété», la «négligence». Encore une fois les deux mots voisinent dans la même phrase. La «satiété» n'est qu'une forme de la négligence. Elle est lassitude du bien au sens qui rend l'âme responsable de cette lassitude: ce n'est pas le bien qui provoque une suralimentation entraînant le dégoût; il n'y a pas, au sens strict du terme, «satiété du bien», dégoût provoqué par le bien; il y a seulement, comme tout le contexte nous entraîne à le comprendre, abandon progressif de l'attention au bien, fatigue et lassitude, négligence (Origène, dans les lignes suivantes, décrit fort bien ce processus inévitable d'éloignement par suite d'un manque d'exercice¹). Sans cesse reviennent dans les textes d'Origène des mots qui indiquent ce que l'âme «aurait dû» faire pour ne pas déchoir: elle aurait dû «persister» dans un travail, qui était de diriger son mouvement vers Dieu, de tendre son regard vers la Source de tout bien, de s'alimenter par cette contemplation en nourriture de Vie. Le motif de la chute est l'abandon de la tension, l'arrêt de mouvement, le relâchement de la vigilance.

¹ Une description analogue se lit chez Plotin, IV 8,4, qui motive la séparation de l'âme d'avec l'intelligence universelle par «la fatigue d'être avec un autre» (*οὐν κάμνονται τῷ σὺν ἄλλῳ εἶναι*) et le fait qu'elle ne regarde plus vers l'intelligible (*μη̄ πρὸς τὸ νοητὸν βλέπῃ*). Plotin se réfère ensuite à l'expression «traditionnelle» (dit-il) de la «perte des ailes» et présente le corps comme la prison de l'âme (*δεσμοῖ*): nous avons donc au moins une terminologie platonicienne commune.

Rien, disons-nous, n'évoque la notion d'une satiéte provoquée par le bien, celui-ci agissant sur l'âme comme une nourriture trop forte ou trop abondante et provoquant le dégoût. On a cependant parfois imaginé qu'Origène avait enseigné cela, d'une part parce qu'il utilise la notion de *κόρος* pour parler d'une satiéte du mal, d'autre part parce qu'il semble avoir conçu deux points extrêmes du bien et du mal, comme deux «combles» symétriques.

S'il y a possibilité d'une satiéte du mal, cela tient justement au fait qu'il s'agit du mal: lorsque l'on se gorge du péché, inévitablement on en éprouve de l'écoirement car le péché dégoûte à la longue; on se met à haïr ce que l'on a d'abord désiré. Ce principe résume des observations banales de psychologie. Origène pense que Dieu a utilisé d'une façon pédagogique cette possibilité de «satieté du mal» en laissant parfois l'homme faire l'expérience jusqu'au bout de son mal: nous avons déjà cité un texte (*Traité de la Prière* 29,14) qui attestait l'expression «*κόρον λαβεῖν*» immédiatement suivie de sa conséquence: cesser (*παύσασθαι*) de désirer ce que l'on désirait d'abord. Deux autres textes vont encore plus loin: dans le *C. Celsum* V 32, parlant de la dispersion des peuples, Origène dit que Dieu, pour les punir, les a laissé subir la tyrannie des mauvais esprits, pour faire leur éducation, pour que, «repus de leur péché, ils le détestent» (*ἴνα κορεσθέντες τῆς ἀμαρτίας μισήσωσιν αὐτήν*)¹. Dans un fragment conservé du *Commentaire sur l'Exode* il est pareillement affirmé que Dieu laisse faire parfois les âmes, «jusqu'à ce que, rassasiées, elles se détournent de l'objet de leur désir» (*ἔως κορεσθεῖσαι ἀποστραφῶσι τὰ ὡν ὁρέγονται*)²).

Mais quel sens aurait dans le plan divin une expérience symétrique de la «satieté du bien»? Absolument aucun et nous n'en trouvons aucune trace chez Origène. Si l'âme, lassée de con-

¹ p. 34,5 (= Philocalie ch. 22,11, ed. Robinson p. 186,18). Voir aussi De princ. III 1,13, p. 218,4 sq. (= Philocalie ch. 21,12 p. 164,4): Dieu laisse le mal venir jusqu'en surface pour que l'homme le «vomisse» (*ἐμέσας*).

² Fragment conservé par la Philocalie, ch. 27,4 p. 246,14. Les auteurs de la Philocalie, Basile et Grégoire de Nazianze, ainsi que leurs lecteurs, avaient donc sous les yeux l'usage qu'Origène faisait de la notion d'une satiéte du mal. Je pense que cet emploi de *κόρος*, au sens de *dégoût*, était si frappant qu'il ne pouvait manquer de communiquer quelque chose de sa nuance à toute expression faite avec *κόρος*. Comme le dira Maxime le Confesseur (*Ambigua*, P. G. 91, col. 1089 B), la définition même du *κόρος* c'est qu'il éteint le désir, c'est le dégoût.

templer Dieu, se détourne de lui, si le même mot (*ἀποστροφή*) décrit le mouvement d'aversion loin de Dieu comme il décrit aussi l'aversion du mal, le contexte est tout à fait différent : le bien n'exerce aucun effet de saturation, donc de répulsion sur l'âme. Il serait absurde de l'imaginer. La même image de «satiété» doit se traduire de deux manières différentes selon le contexte : «satiété» du mal par saturation, «lassitude» du bien par la faute de l'âme négligente.

Il se trouve qu'Origène, à la suite même du texte du *C. Celsum* dont nous avons fait notre point de départ, a exprimé l'idée qu'il y avait «deux points extrêmes» (*δύο δὲ οὐτως ὀνομάσω ἀκρότητες*), un du bien, un du mal¹. Mais quel sens cela a-t-il et les deux «combles» doivent-ils tous deux être imaginés comme des limites provoquant une répulsion? Le point extrême du mal, c'est Satan : il est là, de par la volonté pédagogique de Dieu, pour provoquer en nous, en effet, un sentiment de répulsion. La zone du mal est ainsi limitée par une barrière extrême, à partir de laquelle ne peut que s'opérer le mouvement de retour, l' *ἐπιστροφή*. Le point extrême du bien, d'autre part, est Jésus ; un modèle qu'il faut suivre sur une voie qui va vers Dieu : il n'est dit nulle part, et il serait absurde d'imaginer, que cette voie atteint un seuil. Des expressions comme «le sommet du bien» (*ἀκρώτατα τῶν ἀγαθῶν*) «le plus haut point du bonheur» (*ἀνωτάτω*) ne doivent pas être serrées de trop près². Elles sont compensées par toutes celles qui désignent la voie vers Dieu comme un mouvement qui doit «persister», c'est-à-dire se pro-

¹ C. Celsum VI 45 p. 116,10 sq. Il faudrait poser au moins rapidement un problème grave : Origène a-t-il employé la notion de «comble du mal» seulement sur le plan de l'expérience individuelle des âmes (cf. J. Daniélou, Comble du mal... p. 36) ou bien n'en a-t-il pas fait aussi un principe d'explication de la chute collective des âmes, antérieure à la création du monde historique? Dans ce cas, n'aurait-il pas utilisé la notion cyclique du temps des Stoïciens, lesquels nommaient justement *κύρος* une des deux alternances, celle qui suit l'*ἐκπύρωσις*, l'autre, celle qui précède la *διακόσμησις*, s'appelant *χρησμοσύνη* (ou *λημός*) ? Voir les témoins de cette terminologie : Philon, Leg. All. III 7, Leg. Spec. I 208, Plutarque, Sur l'E de Delphes 9, Hippolyte de Rome, Elenchos IX 10 (voir la discussion du fragment attribué à Héraclite dans G. S. Kirk, Heraclitus. The cosmic fragments, 1954, p. 349–361). Voir Origène, C. Celsum IV 69, pour la notion d'un seuil-*ἐκπύρωσις*, et les notes de H. Chadwick. Voir H. Cornélis, Les fondements... p. 84 sq. La notion d'un comble du mal, non pas individuel, mais sur le plan collectif me semble exister avant Grégoire de Nyse : voir Tatien, Or. 12,4.

² C. Celsum VI 44 p. 115,7. De orat. 29,13 p. 388,2.

longer, progresser, sans que nous en voyons le terme. Du Fils, il est dit qu'il est capable, et lui seul, d'une participation «extrême» (*ἄκρα μετοχή*) à la divinité du Père¹: mais cette expression elle-même ne se réfère pas à une quantité limitée de vertu participée, même si parfois Origène dit que seul le Fils est capable de prendre «toute» la nourriture, de faire «toute» la volonté du Père². Lorsqu'il s'agit des créatures, Origène insiste toujours au contraire sur le caractère illimité de leur participation au bien: tel est principalement le sens de tous les mots qui, dans sa langue, signifient «persister», «durer», «conserver», «progresser», «tendre vers». Dans le texte du *Traité des Principes* décrivant l'éventualité d'une «lassitude du bien» (*satietas boni*, voir plus haut), Origène donnait la recette contre cette lassitude, qui est l'augmentation de l'appétit: «plus nous prenons part à cette béatitude, plus doit s'accroître en nous et augmenter le désir que nous en avons; que toujours nous recevions le Père, le Fils et l'Esprit saint avec plus d'ardeur et de capacité» (I 3,8)³. Ces lignes de Rufin rendent un son parfaitement origénien: c'est le thème spirituel, si fréquemment exposé par Origène, de la «capacité» intérieure (*χωρέιν*), qui doit se faire de plus en plus grande pour recevoir toujours davantage Dieu. Cette augmentation de réceptivité s'exprime aussi par le vocabulaire du progrès: la liberté de chaque nature spirituelle, écrit Origène dans le *Traité des Principe* (II 9,6), lui est donnée «soit pour progresser en imitant Dieu, soit pour regresser par suite de sa négligence (*vel ad profectum . . . vel ad defectum . . .*)⁴; et encore (I 5,2): «toute créature raisonnable mérite louange ou blâme, louange si elle *progresse* vers le bien, blâme si elle dévie»⁵. La vie des créatures raisonnables, qui n'est que participation à la vie de Dieu, est donc décrite non comme un état donné, acquis une fois pour toutes, stable, perfection immobile, mais comme un progrès, une voie à suivre, un mouvement à prolonger, un dynamisme. Ce chemin perpétuel est décrit dans le *Traité de la Prière* en ces termes (25,2): «nous cheminons vers la vertu lorsque nous sommes tendus (*ἐπεκτεινόμενοι*: Phil. 3, 14) vers ce

¹ C. Celsum V 39 p. 43,26–44,2.

² Voir, par exemple, Com. in Jo. XIII 36, 230 sq. ed. Preuschen p. 261,11 sq.

³ p. 62,16–20. Sherwood, op. cit (voir p. 375, n. 2) reconnaît que pour Origène la liberté «peut se développer dans un désir toujours plus étendu du bien» (p. 184), qu'Origène n'ignore pas «l'extension du désir illimité en Dieu infini» (p. 191). ⁴ p. 170,1–2. ⁵ p. 70,6 (*si . . . ad meliora proficiat*).

qui est en avant, en oubliant ce qui est en arrière»¹: l'image même que Grégoire de Nysse rendra célèbre est déjà là. La perfection du Royaume de Dieu, dit encore Origène, viendra pour ceux qui *progressent sans interruption*» ($\eta\; \alphaρστης\; \alphaδιαλείπτως\; προκόπτουσι\; ἐνστήσεται$)². Les premières créatures spirituelles, dont on dit qu'elles étaient «dans la bénédiction» et qu'elles auraient dû «y rester», étaient plus précisément *sur le chemin de la bénédiction* (voir l'expression du *C. Celsum* VII 69 que nous citions plus haut) et elles auraient dû «persister» sur ce «chemin». Si Origène dit parfois que la faute consista en un «mouvement», ce mouvement ne s'oppose pas précisément à une «immobilité», *στάσις*, comme on le lui a parfois reproché³. Sans doute utilise-t-il le vocabulaire de la «stabilité», comme Philon et Clément d'Alexandrie, pour décrire l'état de perfection, et celui du Fils uni au Père, mais cette stabilité est continuité d'un effort, poursuite «ininterrompue» d'un mouvement, non pas immobilité. Les créatures spirituelles étaient créées pour *aller vers* Dieu; la faute a transformé leur mouvement «vers» en un mouvement «doin», comme inévitablement cela arrive lorsque l'on se retourne ($\tauρέπω$: la définition même de la «créature», $\tauο\; γενητόν$, est qu'elle est «mutable», $\tauρεπτόν$). L' *ἀποστροφή* s'oppose à l' *ἐπιστροφή*.

Dans ce contexte doctrinal et spirituel, on comprend en quel sens Origène a pu employer, en des textes que nous ne possédons pas, l'expression « $\kappaόρον\; λαβεῖν\; της\; θεωρίας$ » (certains textes ajoutent: *καὶ της ἀγάπης*): à la nécessité de poursuivre indéfectiblement le mouvement vers Dieu, l'âme a réagi par un manque d'amour et de désir; elle s'est lassée, fatiguée, trop vite satisfaite de ce qu'elle avait; qui cesse de désirer s'appauvrit; elle s'est insensiblement refroidie et éloignée, par négligence, par inattention. La responsabilité de ce *κόρος* est entièrement de son côté: le bien l'*appelle* toujours, indéfectiblement (*ἀδιαλείπτως*); mais à cet appel devait répondre une vigilance également indéfectible⁴.

¹ p. 358,16–17.

² ibid. 1.18.

³ On sait que Maxime le Confesseur oppose à la triade «origéniste» *γένεσις* – *στάσις* – *κίνησις* l'ordre: *γένεσις* – *κίνησις* – *στάσις*. Voir Sherwood, op. cit., et H. U. von Balthasar, Liturgie cosmique, Paris, 1947, p. 80–87.

⁴ Le thème du bien qui «appelle», destiné à une grande faveur chez les néoplatoniciens (voir H. Lewy, Chaldaean Oracles and Theurgy, Le Caire,

Un texte du IVème siècle atteste d'une façon éclatante l'utilisation que les Chrétiens faisaient couramment de la notion de *κόρος*, sous ses différents aspects, pour expliquer la faute première des êtres. Il est remarquable que nous trouvions réunis, dans l'Homélie transmise sous le nom de Basile *Que Dieu n'est pas l'auteur des maux*¹, les trois registres que nous avons déjà trouvés chez Origène: la faute des anges, la faute d'Adam, la faute des âmes (préexistantes?), avec, chaque fois, la mention du *κόρος* qui précèda leur faute.

L'Homélie développe le thème que le mal vient seulement d'une privation du bien. Pour l'âme (il est difficile de comprendre si l'auteur parle de l'âme d'une façon générale ou se réfère à des âmes préexistantes: les verbes de ce paragraphe sont alternativement au présent et à l'aoriste, qui peut avoir un sens gnomique), le bien était de rester près de Dieu (*προσεδρεῖα*)², de «persister dans la contemplation du Beau» (*ἐπιμένειν τῇ τοῦ καλοῦ θεωρίᾳ*). Le mal vient quand l'âme «se lasse de cette bienheureuse jouissance» (*κόρον λαβεῖν τῆς μακαρίας τέρψεως*). Alors elle s'alourdit, tombe dans l'engourdissement (*νυσταγμός*), glisse vers la chair: nous avons dans ce premier développement le vocabulaire habituel dans la tradition du *Phèdre* 247–248: abandon de la contemplation, alourdissement, sommeil, chute dans la matière. Le motif de la chute est une lassitude (*κόρον λαβεῖν*) qui s'oppose à la nécessité de «persister» (*ἐπιμένειν*), ce que précisément nous pensons avoir trouvé chez Origène. L'auteur de l'Homélie enchaîne immédiatement avec un second développement dont le sujet, cette fois, est Adam dans le Paradis (ici, comme chez Origène, la faute d'Adam dans le Paradis est la faute de l'être spirituel). Adam se gorgea trop vite (*ταχὺ . . . ἀναπλησθεὶς*) des biens qui étaient à sa disposition et, pour ainsi dire grisé par son rassasissement (*οὐον ἐξυβρίσας τῷ κόρῳ*), il commit la faute qui consista à préférer les biens du corps à la beauté intelligible³. Reprenant un peu plus loin le

1956, p. 467–471) est déjà explicitement associé au thème du désir insatiable de l'homme chez Philon: De plantatione 23–25. Le langage d'Origène est encore une fois moins imagé: *action* de Dieu, *attention* de l'homme.

¹ En attendant l'édition annoncée dans la collection Sources Chrétiennes par E. Rouillard, nous renvoyons au texte de la PG. Nous utilisons les § 6–9 de cette homélie. ² Terme d'usage neoplatonicien, semble-t-il.

³ Ici se situe le développement sur la prise de conscience de la nudité d'Adam, auquel nous consacrons une étude par ailleurs. La faute d'Adam par *κόρος* se retrouve mentionnée dans d'autres textes ascétiques de Basile:

sujet, l'auteur précisera que l'homme se mit alors à s'occuper des besoins de son corps, ce qui le tira loin de Dieu, loin de sa «tension vers Dieu» ($\tauῆς πρὸς θεὸν ἐντεντίσεως$)¹: ici aussi nous retrouvons les notions traditionnellement associées à $\kappaόρος$: l' ὑπνός, le sommeil, l'inattention. Une troisième fois l'auteur reprend sa démonstration, que le mal est seulement la privation du bien, parlant cette fois des anges. Les anges auraient pu rester fidèles à Dieu, s'ils étaient restés «continuellement» près de Dieu ($παραμένειν . . . διηρεκτῖς$); certains se sont détournés, mais d'autres furent sauvés par l' «ἀκόρεστον» de leur amour, leur insatiabilité: terme admirable, dont nous avons déjà signalé l'existence dans la spiritualité juive et chrétienne, qui nomme exactement l'antidote du $\kappaόρος$, le désir que rien ne peut combler d'aller toujours plus près de Dieu. (Le thème apparaissait aussi dans le récit de la chute, fait par Athanase dans le *Contra Gentes*: avant la faute, l'homme contemplait «continuellement» Dieu, $\alpha\epsilon\iota$, tourné vers le haut, sans cesse renouvelé dans son désir de Dieu, $\alpha\tauακαινούμενος ἐπὶ τῷ πρὸς [θεὸν] πόθῳ$)².

Que s'est-il passé pour que ce langage si traditionnel, si bien adapté à la description d'une faute d'amour, si ancré dans la spiritualité chrétienne, devienne un jour suspect aux yeux des Chrétiens et soit rejeté? Nous pouvons tenter une explication de ce phénomène historique, je veux dire qui prouve l'évolution d'une terminologie. D'une part, ce thème se trouvait indiscutablement associé à des spéculations qui parurent vite aberrantes sur la préexistence des âmes: on pouvait sans aucun doute parler du $\kappaόρος$ - ὑπνός des Anges ou du $\kappaόρος$ – ὕπνος ($\nuοσταγμός$) d'Adam, mais le terme se trouvait compromis parce qu' Origène l'avait (peut-être) employé pour la faute des créatures purement

Adam a commis une faute de glotonnerie, d'ivresse, d'incontinence; ce qu'il a perdu pour ces motifs, (la proximité de Dieu, le loisir propice à la contemplation), l'ascète doit le reconquérir par les vertus correspondantes: le jeûne, la sobriété, la tempérance.

¹ Ce mot existe déjà dans la langue d'Origène. Voir des références dans le Patristic Greek Lexicon, fasc. 2, 1962.

² C. Gentes § 2. Tout ce début du C. Gentes mériterait d'être cité plus longuement comme un excellent témoin de la tradition origénienne au IVème siècle. Quantité d'expressions évoquent les thèmes que nous étudions (voir par exemple la «négligence» et la «lenteur», $\kappaατολυγωρήσαντες . . . καὶ ὀχνήσαντες$, comme motifs de la chute, au § 3 et tout le texte donné par R. Arnou, De platonismo patrum, Rome, 1935, sous le titre *homo aversus est a contemplatione Dei et converrus ad contemplationem sui*).

spirituelles, celles dont la chute nécessita à ses yeux la création du monde matériel. Cette vision, contraire à la conception authentiquement biblique de la création simultanée de l'homme, d'un seul coup corps et âme, se rattachait trop visiblement au thème platonicien de l'odyssée des âmes dans l'au-delà pour qu'un mot, si étroitement lié à tout le vocabulaire du *Phèdre* 246–248, reste admissible. Ce qui, dans l'ensemble de l'œuvre d'Origène, était acceptable comme description un peu approximative de la faute des âmes, n'était plus acceptable quand on en examinait le contexte philosophique. D'autre part, entre Origène et les Cappadociens, se situe l'œuvre des néoplatoniciens, chez lesquels nous trouvons, justement, une élaboration explicite de la notion de *κόρος* au sens de satiété du bien: un mot qui était pris par Origène avec son interprétation spirituelle (manque d'ardeur, lassitude, faiblesse de l'attention et de l'amour) devient inacceptable pour des auteurs qui lisaienr ce même mot chez les néoplatoniciens, avec un sens beaucoup plus précis et redoutable¹.

Il existe dans l'œuvre de Platon une phrase obscure du *Cratyle* (396b) qui dit que le nom de *Cronos* signifie «*κόρος*», non pas au sens de jeune garçon, mais «ce qu'il a de pur et de sans mélange dans son esprit» *καθαρὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκήρωτον τοῦ νοῦ*. Les noms de Zeus, fils de Cronos, et celui d'Ouranos, son père, sont également interprétés². Les néoplatoniciens ont trouvé dans les trois dieux hésiodiques une image des trois hypostases divines³. Si on relit les textes de Plotin concernant notamment le dieu Cronos, on peut comprendre en quel sens ce philosophe utilisait la notion de *κόρος*: Cronos est le dieu qui engendre tous les êtres et reste plein de ceux qu'il a engendrés; il est l'intellect *ἐν κόρῳ*, dans la plénitude⁴; il laisse à son fils le soin de gouverner l'univers,

¹ Le problème est toujours le même, lorsqu'il s'agit d'interpréter l'œuvre d'Origène: le langage que nous étudions se référail, chez Origène, seulement à l'ordre moral et spirituel, ou avait-il déjà chez lui une valeur ontologique? Pour la notion de *κόρος*, Sherwood, op. cit., p. 191, affirme cette double référence, alors que je penche à ne trouver qu'un *κόρος* moral.

² Sur ces trois étymologies voir P. Boyancé, La «doctrine d'Euthyphron» dans le «Cratyle», Revue des Études Grecques 1941, 141–175 (influence d'un système pythagoriant).

³ Voir J. Pépin, Mythe et allégorie, Paris, 1958, p. 203–209.

⁴ Il me semble inutile de supposer l'existence d'un *adjectif* *κόρος*, qui signifierait «pur» (cf. Liddell-Scott-Jones, *κόρος* (B)) pour expliquer le texte du

restant lui-même comme il est, lui qui a la plénitude des belles choses (*κόρον ἔχοντι τῶν καλῶν*)¹. L'intellect parfait, replié en lui-même, nourri de sa propre substance, sans rien d'adventice, qui s'ajoute de l'extérieur, donne l'image de la plénitude: il se possède dans la plénitude (*ἐν κόρῳ*); il est le dieu plénitude, sans mélange, pur, restant en lui-même: la «pureté sans mélange de l'intelligence» (*Cratyle* 396b) correspond à ce que l'on peut aussi décrire comme la plénitude (*κόρος*) de l'être rempli de ses propres produits. Cet état de *κόρος* ne s'accompagne d'aucune ivresse (*νοῦς δὲ οὐεντὸν ἔχει ἐν κόρῳ καὶ οὐ μεθύει ἔχων*²). Au contraire de Cronos, la figure mythique de Poros représente aux yeux de Plotin celui qui n'est pas resté en lui-même (il est entré dans le jardin de Zeus pour la naissance d'Aphrodite, l'âme du monde), qui se répand au dehors, qui est en contact avec la matière³: dans cet état d'effusion, l'intellect est nourri par une alimentation «qui lui vient de l'extérieur»: le nectar coule d'en haut⁴. Aussi Poros ne supporte-t-il pas cette plénitude

Cratyle 396 b. Il s'agit d'un intellect-plénitude, *κόρος-νοῦς*, comme le montre l'examen de toute la tradition platonicienne concernant Cronos. (Dans le même sens, voir la note 119 de J. Pépin, op. cit. p. 205, et une note manuscrite d'H. Saffrey, communiquée par une lettre du 9.7.63: «ce qui est satié de soi est le pur métaphysiquement», à propos des textes de Proclus sur *Cratyle* 396). Voir déjà Plutarque, *De facie* 941 sq. (texte sur lequel J. P. Vernant a attiré mon attention), qui est peut-être le premier témoin d'une exégèse de *Cratyle* 396b: Cronos endormi, gorgé de nectar, est le type de l'intellect *εαντὸν καθ' εαντὸν καθαρὸν καὶ ἀκήρατον*. Le repliement sur soi, dans un état de plénitude (ou «satieté»), est aussi l'état de pureté et d'intégrité. Pour Plotin, voir III 5,9 (et aussi III 5,2). Cronos sert à désigner l'état de l'âme non déployée à l'extérieur (cf. aussi I 4,10); il est la figure du Dieu «plein de sa propre substance» (cf. III 5,7 et V 1,7), sans rien en lui d'adventice, d'importé (*ἐπικτητὸν, ἐπακτόν*). Voir aussi Porphyre, *Sent.* 40: *τῇ ζωῇ τῇ ἀραιοφεστάτῃ καὶ πλήρει ἀρ' αὐτῆς ἐν αὐτῇ τε καὶ ἰδενμένῃ καὶ κεκορεμένῃ δὲ εαυτῆς . . .*

¹ V 8,13. Voir ces textes de Plotin dans l'édition Henry-Schwyzer, avec les références données dans l'apparat (pour V 1,7, voir le texte de St Augustin, *De Consensu Evang. I 23, 35, sur Saturnus, satur-nus*).

² III 5,9.

³ L'état d'effusion opposé à l'état de repli sur soi: I 4,10. Poros se mêle à l'indétermination: III 5,7. La figure de Poros joue un rôle dans la tradition platonicienne, comme l'atteste déjà l'usage qu'Origène en fait (voir p. 382, n. 3). On sait que pour l'interprétation des figures de Poros et de Pénia, Plotin corrigeait la pensée de ses prédecesseurs, notamment de Plutarque (voir la note de l'édition Bouillet des Ennéades, pour III 5,9, et celle de la traduction de Plotin de Cousin, tome VI, p. 443).

⁴ Toute la différence entre Cronos et Poros tient dans le mot *ἐπακτόν*: Cronos est plein «sans que rien se soit ajouté à lui»; Poros est rempli par ad-

adventice sans tomber dans l'ivresse (*τούτῳ δὲ μεθύοντι ἐπακτὸρ τὸ τῆς πληρώσεως*): il s'endort¹. Dans l'opposition des deux figures mythiques du Dieu Cronos et de Poros, le critère est justement fourni par la notion de *κόρος*: ce qui pour le Dieu replié en lui-même est «plénitude», perfection, devient pour l'être en contact avec la matière «satiété», ivresse. Le nectar est une nourriture trop forte. Un autre texte de Plotin réunit (comme nous avons été amenée à le faire pour expliquer les textes d'Origène) la terminologie du *Phèdre* 247 et celle du mythe de Poros dans le *Banquet* 203: Plotin décrit d'abord les âmes allant en cortège à la contemplation du Beau; celui-ci est assimilé à une lumière brillante; elle remplit ceux qui «peuvent» voir mais éblouit ceux d'en bas qui «se détournent n'étant pas capables de voir» etc. . . .; elle est ensuite assimilée au nectar dont certains sont «pour ainsi dire enivrés et remplis», parce que c'est dans toute leur âme que la beauté arrive². Il faudrait ajouter à ces textes ceux de Porphyre, qui prouvent également l'existence chez les néoplatoniciens d'une notion philosophique de *κόρος*, mais qui sont d'autant plus difficiles à interpréter que les manuscrits donnent parfois *κόρος* opposé à Pénia là où les exégètes modernes préfèrent corriger le texte pour retrouver l'opposition *Poros-Pénia*, chargée par Porphyre de symboliser les deux états de l'âme, le premier correspondant à la conversion vers l'intelligible, le second à la conversion vers le sensible³. Il nous suffit de signaler aux historiens de l'origénisme qu'entre l'emploi qu'Origène pouvait faire de *κόρος* (un emploi banal, encore un peu imagé, traditionnel sur divers registres) et celui que pouvaient imaginer ses lecteurs à la fin du IVème siècle (un emploi philosophique: la nourriture divine étant accusée de

jonction. C'est exactement la distinction qu'Origène utilise pour les attributs divins, inhérents en Dieu et dans le Fils, naturels et faits de leur propre substance, adventices chez l'homme (cf. p. 386, n. 3 et p. 391, n. 1). Poros est au festin des dieux (III 5, 9 lignes 37 sq.) comme les âmes préexistantes étaient au festin de la contemplation. Mais il était impossible pour Poros de supporter la plénitude du festin tandis qu'Origène accuse les âmes d'avoir été négligentes: elles auraient pu persister dans leur attention avec un désir insatiable.

¹ III 5,9.

² V 8,10 ligne 33.

³ Sent. 37 sq. Voir W. Theiler, *Porphyrios und Augustin* p. 43. Ces passages de Porphyre seront étudiés dans l'ouvrage (à paraître) de Pierre Hadot, sur Porphyre et Marius Victorinus.

provoquer elle-même une «satiété), se situent les textes néo-platoniciens, ayant spéculé sur cette notion. Ceci nous explique peut-être la réaction d'un Grégoire de Nysse.

Grégoire de Nysse commente le verset des Béatitudes dans lequel le «rassasiement» (*χορτασθήσονται*) est promis à ceux qui ont faim et soif de justice¹: le développement tourne autour de la notion de «plénitude», que Grégoire exprime de préférence avec le mot *πλησμονή*². Il oppose à ce propos deux sortes de plénitude, celle du plaisir sensible, celle de la vertu³. Le rassasiement du plaisir sensible est doublement fallacieux: d'une part, il n'y a pas véritable rassasiement; nous restons avides, comme des tonneaux percés incapables de garder ce qu'on verse en eux; ensuite parce que le fait même de se remplir, lorsqu'il s'agit de biens matériels, procure peu à peu le dégoût, enlève le désir que l'on avait au début. Au contraire, lorsqu'il s'agit de la vertu, les deux qualités s'ajoutent à la notion de plénitude: c'est une véritable plénitude, qu'accompagne une satisfaction durable; et ce n'est pas la suppression du désir (le dégoût), bien au contraire: «avec le rassasiement, la plénitude enflamme en nous le désir, au lieu de l'émosser» (*πλησμονή ἐξάπτουσα κόρω τὴν δρεξιν οὐκ ἀμβλύνοντα*). Loin de provoquer l'aversion (*ἀποστροφή*), cette plénitude rend notre désir encore plus grand, elle le «tend» (*ἐπίτασιν ποιεῖ τῆς δρέξεως*). On est donc doublement récompensé par le rassasiement de l'action vertueuse: on a le sentiment d'être plein et cependant on garde encore le désir de se remplir davantage; la vertu se fait sentir comme quelque chose de toujours neuf, jeune, florissant (*ἀκραυγής, νεαρά, ἀκμάζοντα*); jamais ne vient le moment qui donnerait satiéte de cette bonne activité (*οὐδεὶς ἔστι καιρὸς . . . τῆς ἀγαθῆς κόρον ἐμποιῶν ἐνεργείας*).

On le voit, dans ce texte, Grégoire utilise le mot *πλησμονή*, et non *κόρος*, pour désigner le rassasiement qui ne connaît pas

¹ Homélies sur les Béatitudes IV, col. 1244–1245.

² Ceci est assez étonnant car le mot est généralement péjoratif. Voir aussi (col. 1244 B) *πλήσμιον*. En attendant une édition critique de ces homélies, nous devons nous contenter du texte de la P. G.

³ Il se peut que ce thème remonte à la morale aristotélicienne. Voir le texte d'Alexandre d'Aphrodise, *De anima*, ed. Bruns p. 168,9–15, cité par Sherwood, op. cit. p. 188, n. 16: *οὐδεὶς . . . κόρος ενδαιμονίας καὶ ἀρετῆς*. Origène ne peut avoir ignoré cet usage: il n'a pas parlé d'un *κόρος* du bien, en ce sens fort.

de satiéte. Lorsque l'on parle de *κόρος*, peut-être a-t-on l'idée que la plénitude est trop forte, qu'elle émousse le désir, qu'il y a une certaine usure, une lassitude. *Kόρος* est peut-être lié spécialement aux plaisirs de la nourriture matérielle. On ne peut pas parler d'un *κόρος* de la contemplation, parce que cela voudrait dire que la contemplation provoque dans les âmes cette usure du désir (*ἀμβλύνει*) que provoquent les plaisirs sensibles. L'accent est mis sur un tout autre aspect du problème que chez Origène: celui-ci accusait les âmes de manquer d'amour et d'ardeur (dans ce contexte, *κόρος* signalait qu'elles avaient le tort de «se lasser»); Grégoire a réfléchi sur l'effet que produisent diverses nourritures, matérielles ou purement spirituelles, sur l'âme et ne saurait qu'affirmer que «le bien ne provoque jamais de dégoût» (dans ce contexte, *κόρος* signifie dégoût).

La langue évolue. Les notions se précisent peu à peu. Certains écrivains font progresser le langage de leur groupe social ou religieux. Ils refusent ce que l'on acceptait avant eux. Ils spécialisent certains mots, leur donnent une valeur «technique» pour certaines idées. C'est ce qui est arrivé, bien entendu, pour le grec des Chrétiens: des images de l'époque classique, que les premiers écrivains utilisaient spontanément, sont plus tard adoptées ou rejetées, selon que leur sens actuel, dans la littérature néoplatonicienne par exemple, les laissait, ou ne les laissait pas, disponibles pour un contenu chrétien. Nous sommes, en tous cas, arrivés à cette conclusion en faisant l'histoire du mot *κόρος*: une image traditionnelle dans la morale grecque, d'abord adoptée par les auteurs juifs et chrétiens pour nommer la faute d'être déchus de la bénédiction (orgueil, assouplissement ou lassitude), n'est plus acceptée à la fin du IVème siècle quand on risque d'y voir, à cause des spéculations néoplatoniciennes, l'idée que le bien procurerait lui-même un effet de «satieté». Origène n'avait pas élaboré cette notion, elle était contraire à sa conception du bien, infinie richesse à laquelle l'homme peut participer toujours plus largement; il avait seulement enseigné qu'un risque attend toujours l'homme dans sa vie spirituelle, le manque d'amour et de vigilance, l'*ἀπροσεξία*. «Se lasser» de contempler Dieu est la faute suprême, défaillance de l'attention et de la ferveur, puisqu'il faut progresser «sans

aucune défaillance», dans la tension indéfectible de la volonté libre, dans l'ardeur d'un amour sans «satiété»¹.

¹ Essai de classement des sens ou emplois de *κόρος* – *κορεννυσθαι* dans les textes philosophiques ou religieux de l'hellenisme tardif:

1. *κόρος*: démesure, insolence, révolte (à peu près l'équivalent de *ὕβρις* – *ὑβρίζειν*) (les démons).

2. *κόρος*: engourdissement, ivresse, sommeil, torpeur (Adam, Poros).

3. *κόρος*: plénitude, rassasiement (Cronos).

4. *κόρος*: dégoût provoqué par l'excès du mal ou du plaisir sensible (expérience pédagogique du mal chez Origène).

5. *κόρον λαβεῖν*: se lasser de (à peu près l'équivalent de *ἀγνία*, *ἀμέλεια* ou *ἀρθυμία*, ou encore du thème de la fatigue) (les âmes préexistantes, dans le système d'Origène, à la suite du Phèdre 247).

C'est par suite d'une insistance sur les sens n. 3 et n. 4 que l'emploi n. 5 a été mal compris et refusé.

Un commentaire de Maxime le Confesseur sur le Cantique?

J. KIRCHMEYER S. J., Chantilly

Parmi les cinq types de chaînes exégétiques que l'on connaisse sur le Cantique des cantiques, il en est un qui à la particularité de faire une assez large place à S. Maxime le Confesseur. Il s'agit du type B. Or ce rôle de commentateur du Cantique, quelle que soit la façon dont il faut le comprendre, est d'autant plus surprenant de la part de Maxime, que les autres chaînes sur le Cantique ignorent totalement son nom et que les œuvres authentiques du Confesseur ne citent jamais le Cantique des cantiques. Serait-on en face d'une mystification, ou aurions-nous au contraire la chance de pouvoir récupérer, par le truchement d'une chaîne, les lambeaux d'un ouvrage que la tradition directe ne nous a pas transmis? Pour un auteur de l'envergure de Maxime, la question vaut d'être tirée au clair.

La chaîne du type B se présente sous deux états¹: une forme simple et une forme composite. La forme simple, B¹ suivant la dénomination de M. Faulhaber, est attestée par le *Paris. gr.* 152 (fol. 258–320 v) du XIII^o siècle et par le *Scorial. gr.* R. I. 3 (fol. 70–173) du XVII^o siècle, et partiellement, mais sous le nom de Procope, par le *Vatic. gr.* 728 (fol. 204–215) du XVI^o siècle; ses scholies sont anonymes et donnent à l'ensemble l'allure d'un commentaire suivi. La forme composite, B², que Faulhaber a retrouvée dans au moins huit manuscrits des XV^o–XVII^o siècles, est le résultat d'une compilation tardive: au commentaire de la forme simple, qu'elle désigne sous le lemme *τῶν γ' πατέρων*, elle

¹ Sur ce type, voir G. Karo et I. Lietzmann, *Catenarum graecarum catalogus* (= *Nachrichten der K. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse*, 1902, Heft 1, 3, 5) p. 317–318; H. Lietzmann, *Catena*, Freiburg i. B., 1897, p. 22 et 65; M. Faulhaber, *Hohelied-, Proverbien- und Prediger-Catena* (= *Theologische Studien der Leo-Gesellschaft*, 4) Wien, 1902, p. 6–19. Cf. également R. Devreesse, *Chaînes, exégétiques grecques*, dans *Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément*, t. 1, col. 1158–1161.

juxtapose un commentaire métrique de Psellos paraphrasant celui de Grégoire de Nysse et s'arrêtant comme lui avec le chapitre VI, 9¹ et un commentaire de Théodoret de Cyr, que l'on ne connaît d'ailleurs pas autrement². Si le type B² a adopté le découpage en scholies propre aux chaînes, il n'est pas une chaîne, en rigueur de termes, mais un triple commentaire ayant conservé dans leur intégralité les ouvrages qu'il incorporait. Le fait est évident pour l'exégèse dite *des trois Pères* ou pour Psellos, et il y a tout lieu de croire, sauf abrégements possibles de détail, qu'il en va de même pour Théodoret.

Laissant de côté Psellos et Théodoret, nous ne retiendrons ici que la partie commune à B¹ et B², c'est-à-dire l'exégèse *des trois Pères*, pour laquelle nous disposons d'un texte imprimé parmi les œuvres de Psellos³.

La première question que soulève ce texte vient de son demi-anonymat. Qui sont ces trois Pères? Le titre de la chaîne est seul à nous le révéler, et encore offre-t-il une notable divergence. B¹ porte en effet: ‘Ἐρμηνεία κατὰ παράφρασιν τοῦ ἀσματος τῶν ἀσμάτων συλλεγεῖσα ἀπό τε τῶν εἰς τοῦτο ἐρμηνεῶν τοῦ ἄγιον Γρηγορίου τοῦ Νύσσης καὶ τοῦ ἄγιον Κυρίλλου καὶ τοῦ ἄγιον Νεήλου καὶ ἀπὸ διαφόρων ἐρνοῦῶν τοῦ ἄγιον Μαξίμου⁴. Autrement dit: Grégoire, Nil, Cyrille et Maxime, bref quatre Pères. B² en revanche ne mentionne pas Cyrille, et son lemme habituel τῶν γ' πατέρων permet d'avancer que l'absence de Cyrille dans son titre n'est pas un accident de la transmission manuscrite. Faulhaber pensait que le titre de B², sans Cyrille, offrait le libellé primitif, mais il n'en a pas donné d'explication satisfaisante et sa conclusion ne semble pas devoir s'imposer. De plus, si l'on se rappelle que la source «Grégoire» fait défaut à partir du chapitre VI, 9, on peut légitimement se demander ce que vaut le lemme insolite

¹ Édité dans J. Meursius, Eusebii Polychronii Pselli in Canticum cantorum expositiones, Leyden, 1617, p. 113–168; cette édition respecte mieux le texte de Psellos que celle de Migne PG 122, col. 537–686, empruntée à la Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum, t. 2, Parisiis, 1624, p. 681–761, et où certains passages reproduits en prose reviennent à Psellos, ainsi col. 548d–549a, 549d–552b, 617d–620a et 637c–640a.

² Édité parmi les œuvres de Théodoret, dans PG 81, col. 27–214. Ce texte aurait besoin d'être révisé de près.

³ Voir PG 122, col. 537–685; c'est à ce texte, malgré ses insuffisances, que nous renverrons habituellement. Pour les chapitres VI, 8–VIII, 14, on peut consulter la recension du Pseudo-Procope figurant dans PG 87, col. 1156–1780.

⁴ Cf. M. Faulhaber, op. cit., p. 15–16.

des trois Pères réduits à deux pour le dernier quart de l'exégèse du Cantique.

L'unique moyen de vérifier l'exactitude du titre de la chaîne est de rendre aux divers auteurs utilisés leurs extraits respectifs, et d'isoler, du même coup, par retranchements successifs, ce qui revient à Maxime. Mais ce travail de restitution littéraire se heurte à deux difficultés majeures :

1. Le commentaire de Nil, toujours inédit, n'est accessible que par les fragments assez maltraités que fournit la chaîne de Procope sur le Cantique¹, et pour nombre de versets son témoignage fait totalement défaut. La même remarque s'applique, à plus forte raison, à Cyrille, s'il doit entrer en ligne de compte, car les scholies mises sous son nom sont trop courtes ou d'un authenticité trop douteuse pour que l'on puisse se livrer à une confrontation utile. Ainsi, entre Grégoire, grandeur parfaitement connue, et Maxime le Confesseur, qui est l'inconnue du problème, s'étend une zone d'indétermination d'autant plus floue d'ailleurs que Maxime lui-même a fort bien pu s'inspirer de Grégoire ou de Nil.

2. La seconde difficulté tient au caractère homogène des scholies. Une lecture, même cursive, de ces textes montre qu'il n'existe aucune différence de ton, de forme, de présentation, entre la dernière partie de la chaîne, tributaire des seuls Nil et Maxime, et les chapitres I à VI, 9. La disparition de Grégoire semble n'avoir nullement affecté le caténiste, et ses scholies conservent leur abondance et leur massivité. De plus chaque scholie donne l'impression d'un ensemble, stylistiquement organisé, ignorant les sutures, les redites, les reprises et les incohérences que l'on rencontre habituellement dans les chaînes où se juxtaposent des matériaux de provenance disparate.

Dès lors, la chaîne *des trois Pères* est-elle vraiment une chaîne ? En d'autres termes, le caténiste s'est-il suffisamment effacé devant les commentaires qu'il exploitait, pour que l'on puisse espérer retrouver chez lui, à peu près telle quelle, leur exégèse respective ? Ou au contraire a-t-il si bien «paraphrasé» les originaux, que nous n'ayons plus ici un florilège, mais un commentaire personnel indépendant ?

Les auteurs qui se sont occupés des chaînes sur le Cantique ont donné à cette question une réponse contradictoire. Faulhaber, cherchant à préciser la part de Grégoire dans les chaînes

¹ Voir PG 87, col. 1545–1753.

du type B, avouait, après un examen relativement sommaire, n'avoir identifié aucun passage des homélies sur le Cantique : « nirgends eine formelle und nur selten eine ideelle Harmonie... »¹. W. Riedel, et surtout L. Welsershaimb², s'appuyant sur quelques textes des chapitres VI–VIII dont le vocabulaire et les thèmes évoquent particulièrement Maxime, admettaient que la chaîne comportait des emprunts au Confesseur assez considérables pour que l'on songe à dégager l'orientation générale et les caractéristiques de son exégèse du Cantique.

A qui donner raison ?

D'une part, la constatation de Faulhaber est indéniable, encore qu'il faille lui apporter des correctifs. La confrontation de plusieurs grandes tranches de la chaîne avec les homélies de Grégoire ou les fragments de Nil montre que le caténiste n'a jamais eu pour règle de retranscrire servilement ou fidèlement ses modèles, à plus forte raison de leur emprunter matériellement de longs développements. Les rapports textuels précis n'excèdent guère, en fait, trois ou quatre lignes. On notera les suivants, parmi les plus significatifs³:

col. 568 a b	<i>φατνώματα δέ εἰσιν . . . σανίδων</i> – Langerbeck p. 112,2–4
col. 569 b c	<i>καὶ ἐφ' ἵκανόν . . . δρῶτο</i> – Langerbeck p. 114,5–9
col. 572 b	<i>μηδ' ὀλως ποτέ . . . ἐλόμενοι</i> – Nil, PG 87, 1577d
col. 572 a b	<i>συμπτνγομένην ταῖς τοῦ βίου ἀκάνθαις . . . θυγατέρας τοῦ διαβόλου</i> – Langerbeck p. 114, 18–20

¹ Cf. M. Faulhaber, op. cit., p. 19.

² W. Riedel, Die Auslegung des Hohenliedes in der jüdischen Gemeinde und der griechischen Kirche, Leipzig, 1898, p. 95–97: „Es ist aber interessant, daß der große Mystagoge, der die ps. dionysischen Schriften und Anschauungen in der griechischen Kirche popularisierte, auch der Schöpfer dieser mystischen Auslegung der HL gewesen ist, die später besonders im Abendlande so vielfach gepflegt wurde“ (p. 97). Réflexions analogues de L. Welsershaimb à la fin d'une étude intitulée: Das Kirchenbild der griechischen Väterkommentare zum Hohen Liede, dans Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie, t. 70, 1948, p. 441–444.

³ Pour Nil, nous renvoyons aux fragments de la chaîne de Procope, dans PG 87, col. 1545 ss., et pour Grégoire à l'édition critique de H. Langerbeck, Gregorii Nysseni in Canticum Canticorum, Leiden, 1960.

col. 608d *ἐν τῷ ἀκαρδίνῳ στεφάνῳ . . . ἐνυμφεύσατο —*
 Nil, 87, 1636c

col. 621d–622b citation de Col. III, 12 — Nil, 87, 1660b

col. 624b c *ἐν τῷ μὴ ἐπιδείκνυσθαι . . . οἰκείως ἔχειν —*
 Langerbeck p. 270,13–16

col. 624d *ἴδιαζόντως γάρ . . . ἀποτέτακται —* Langerbeck
 p. 272,12–14
 τὸ θεῖον cf. Langerbeck p. 217,12 (et *passim*)
 διάθεσις . . . μικρὸν δέ . . . Nil 87, 1660 lignes
 5 et 10
 εἰς τιμὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ Langerbeck p. 272,21

col. 625d *τὸ δὲ προκάλυμμα τοῦ καρποῦ αὐστηρόν* Langer-
 beck p. 282,14
 παράδεισος συνηρεφής Langerbeck p. 282,7
 μετὰ τὸ πεπανθῆναι . . . διαφαίνεται — Langer-
 beck p. 282,16–17

col. 628c *κρόκον δέ . . . θερμότητος —* Langerbeck p. 284,
 1–4

col. 632c *εὐωχηθήτω . . . ἐμὸν βρῶμά ἔστιν —* Langerbeck
 p. 303,18–20

col. 632d *ῆκουσεν δὲ νυμφίος . . . παρακονσθῆναι —* Nil 87,
 1672b lignes 5–7.

La plupart du temps, la dépendance n'apparaît, pour ainsi dire, qu'en filigrane, à travers un mot ou une tournure de phrase. Il est clair que, tout en ayant sous les yeux les homélies de Grégoire et le commentaire de Nil, l'auteur de la chaîne s'est servi de ces textes comme de stimulants ou de guides pour sa propre exégèse, sans se sentir le moins du monde lié par eux. A leur endroit, il s'est comporté à peu près comme Psellos paraphrasant Grégoire, ou comme Grégoire lui-même vis à vis d'Origène. Il n'est plus dès lors un caténiste, mais un *commentateur*.

D'autre part, il est tout aussi indéniable que nombre de thèmes, d'expressions, de catégories mentales, sont propres à Maxime le Confesseur, et ce phénomène n'intéresse pas seulement les scholies finales auxquelles s'étaient arrêtés Riedel ou Welsersheimb, mais le commentaire dans son ensemble. Autant l'influence de Grégoire et de Nil était discrète et allusive, autant celle de Maxime se fait voyante. Un relevé substantiel des analogies n'a pas sa place ici, et l'on peut se contenter de quelques parallèles plus explicites.

D'abord la notion de divinisation (*θέωσις*). Celle-ci figure dans une dizaine de développements différents et l'auteur l'envisage comme l'œuvre propre de l'Esprit-Saint (col. 617c, 633d), la grâce par excellence (col. 580d et *passim*), l'accession au sur-naturel (col. 633d), le terme béatifiant de l'existence chrétienne (col. 677bc) en même temps que le processus d'assimilation qui le prépare (col. 677c), enfin comme une forme d'extase ou d'ivresse (col. 577b, 621d, 633cd, 665b) en rapport avec le dernier stade de la vie spirituelle (col. 636c, 672d). Il suffirait de rapprocher ces textes de quelques passages-types de Maxime pour en saisir l'étroite parenté¹.

Autre thème maximien, la distinction entre la loi naturelle, la loi écrite et la loi spirituelle. L'auteur de la chaîne l'utilise fréquemment (col. 541a, 541d, 588d, 589d, 592b, 612c, 613d–616a, 677a) comme une structure familière de son monde spirituel qu'il n'éprouve le besoin ni de justifier ni d'expliquer en détail, mais qui ne se comprend pleinement que dans les perspectives de Maxime².

Notons encore l'accent mis sur la nécessité de la mort au sensible et au créé (*νέκρωσις*, col. 617b, 629a, 628d, 633b, 640c d) pour entrer dans la vie³, le rôle de la sagesse comme charisme suprême (*σοφία*, col. 548c, 629a, 640b, 656c, 664b, 668d)⁴, la notion d'*ἀτρεψία*, condition des *possessores* (col. 561c, 581a, 584b, 601c, 624a, 677b)⁵, et bien entendu l'excellence de la théologie apophatique (col. 584c, 636c).

Quelques associations, à la fois notionnelles et verbales, rappellent également Maxime: *ἡδονή-δόθυνη* dans la genèse du péché d'origine et de tout péché en général (col. 680d)⁶, *Ἐλλειψ-ὑπερβολή* à propos des passions (col. 620c, 628c, 665c, 669c, 672b)⁷, ou le couple *λόγοι-τρόποι*, si souvent repris⁸, sans parler de *πρᾶξις-θεωρία*.

On rencontre même des expressions moins attendues, mais attestées aussi chez Maxime, comme l'*ἀφασία* devant la trans-

¹ Cf. PG 90, col. 280d–281b, 320–321a; PG 91, col. 33bc et 1237bc.

² Voir en particulier H. Urs von Balthasar, Kosmische Liturgie. Das Weltbild Maximus' des Bekenners, Einsiedeln, 1962, p. 288–312.

³ Cf. PG 90, col. 612ab.

⁴ Cf. PG 90, col. 521d–524a.

⁵ Cf. PG 90, col. 257d, 400d, 405d, 5 408b, 673d.

⁶ Cf. PG 90, col. 593b, 597c, 628 ss.

⁷ Cf. PG 90, col. 585a.

⁸ Cf. PG 90, col. 397d–400, 612c, 677c.

cendance de la divinité (col. 609 c)¹ ou l'*ἀληγλονχία*, la connexion des vertus (col. 585 b)².

Ces multiples rapprochements de pensée et de vocabulaire, qui ne relèvent pas d'emprunts textuels précis, s'expliqueraient d'une manière fort simple évidemment, si l'auteur de la chaîne *des trois Pères* était Maxime lui-même. Mais, outre le silence total de la tradition à ce sujet, on peut faire valoir contre cette hypothèse plusieurs arguments décisifs.

D'abord, car c'est un fait dont il faut bien tenir compte, Maxime n'a pas exprimé ses catégories spirituelles ou mystiques dans les formules et sous le symbolisme du Cantique des cantiques, même dans les passages où il évoque explicitement le thème des noces de l'âme avec le Verbe³. Sur ce point, qui mériterait d'ailleurs un traitement particulier, Maxime se sépare de Grégoire de Nysse ou d'Origène.

De plus, la fréquence, parfois intempestive, de certaines tournures *maximiennes*, surtout les binômes *ἡδονή-όδύνη* ou *ἔλειψις-άπερβολή*, nous paraissent caractériser l'élève qui a trop bien appris sa leçon. Maxime n'a pas l'habitude de se répéter avec cette intempérance et cette monotonie. A plus forte raison en va-t-il d'éléments auxquels Maxime n'accorde pas une attention particulière ou dont il n'a pas systématisé l'emploi, comme le verbe *νιοθετεῖν* (col. 633 a d et 664 b)⁴, le couple *σύμβολον-ἐπιφάνεια* (col. 541 d, 544 a, 544 d, 545 a, 548 c, 549 b, 601 d, 669 a, 676 d), ou la triple division de la vie spirituelle en purification, illumination et perfection (col. 577 d, 617 c, 636 c, 645 d, 664 a, 677 a)⁵.

Enfin, la doctrine qui se dégage du commentaire, tout en étant dans la ligne de celle de Maxime, reste pourtant assez primaire, ou du moins simplificatrice, laissant de côté des aspects typiques de la synthèse maximienne. Elle manque en particulier de cette dimension christologique, qui constitue l'originalité et la profondeur de l'œuvre du Confesseur. Tel chapitre sur les *γνωρίσματα* de l'Epoux (col. 644 c–649 c), par exemple, auraient connu chez Maxime des développements plus théologiques que les considérations un peu courtes de notre commen-

¹ Cf. PG 90, col. 673 d.

² Cf. PG 90, col. 393 a et 889 a.

³ Voir PG 90, col. 400 b ou PG 91, 681 b.

⁴ Cf. PG 91, col. 692 c.

⁵ Cf. PG 90, col. 673 c.

taire. A n'en pas douter, nous sommes là en face du travail d'un disciple, non devant la création d'un maître¹.

Résumons les conclusions auxquelles nous conduit l'examen de la chaîne *des trois Pères*.

1. Ce texte amalgame de façon trop personnelle les ouvrages dont il s'inspire, pour pouvoir être encore considéré comme une chaîne. Par sa structure et son contenu, il constitue un authentique *commentaire* et peut figurer honnêtement parmi les productions exégétiques de la période byzantine.

2. L'auteur anonyme du commentaire est assez familier avec les écrits du Confesseur pour en adopter sans effort les cadres de pensée et pour s'en assimiler les thèmes majeurs et la terminologie. Même ce qu'il glane chez Grégoire et Nil est récrit selon les perspectives et *dans l'esprit* de Maxime: ἀπὸ διαφόρων ἐργοῦντος ἀγίου Μακρίου disait fort bien le titre de la chaîne. Là réside l'originalité d'une oeuvre sans prétention peut-être, mais où s'affirme l'influence féconde du moine de Chrysopolis.

3. Enfin, nous n'avons plus aucune raison d'invoquer notre texte comme *témoin* d'un commentaire que Maxime aurait consacré au Cantique des cantiques.

¹ Pour compléter ces données, il faudrait y joindre l'apport de la «chaîne» sur les Proverbes éditée sous le nom de Procope dans PG 87, col. 1221–1544, dans laquelle on retrouve les mêmes tendances, les mêmes procédés et la même langue, et qui doit avoir la même origine que notre commentaire. La titre de la chaîne est déjà, à lui seul, révélateur.

Traditio and Exomologesis in Tertullian

W. P. LE SAINT S. J., Mundelein, Ill.

In the early chapters of his treatise *De paenitentia* Tertullian writes of the nature, the necessity and the efficacy of personal penitence or conversion. His concern is with the sinner's subjective reaction against his sin and guilt, a reaction which is known in later theological literature as the virtue of penitence. This personal penitence Tertullian describes as involving regret for the past, the reprobation of one's evil deeds, satisfaction of the divine justice, and a sincere purpose of amendment. The rite of Baptism signs and seals the conversion of the unbaptized, and the whole process, including both the subjective element of personal penitence and the objective element supplied by the external rite of Baptism is, in Tertullian's terminology, the *prima planca salutis*, the so-called *paenitentia prima*. In justifying *paenitentia prima* Tertullian regularly appeals to the authority of sacred Scripture. Personal penitence is demanded of the sinner because Scripture tells us repeatedly that God demands it; the external rite of Baptism is required because Scripture insists clearly and emphatically on its necessity.

In later chapters of the *De paenitentia*, and throughout the treatise *De pudicitia*, Tertullian is concerned chiefly with the *paenitentia secunda* of exomologesis, the penitence of those who have sinned after Baptism. This involves, in addition to the subjective reaction of the sinner against his guilt, a number of external features such as the confession of one's sin before the Church, the performance of public penitential acts under the direction of ecclesiastical authority, some sort of exclusion from communion with the Church, and the forgiveness of the sinner by the bishop. It is clear that the subjective elements required in the *paenitentia secunda* of exomologesis have the same Scriptural justification which they have in the *paenitentia prima* of Baptism. But what justification does Tertullian find for the external

features of *paenitentia secunda* which are analogues to the external rite of Baptism in *paenitentia prima*? Does he propose evidence from Scripture – either direct or indirect – to support his demands for the sinner's excommunication? for his acts of public penance? for confession and ecclesiastical reconciliation? Does the *paenitentia secunda* of exomologesis have Scriptural justification just as truly as does the *paenitentia prima* of Baptism, or would it not be more accurate to say that Tertullian justifies exomologesis from tradition alone? And if exomologesis has its justification in tradition, in what sense is the term "tradition" to be understood? Is it merely an ecclesiastical tradition – an *inventum humanum* – or is it, in some sense, scriptural and apostolic?

Tertullian's views on the nature and function of tradition are still, in part, matters of controversy, but the following brief synopsis would probably be acceptable to most students of his thought. The revelation of God is known to men in the apostolic tradition which is found in the Christian churches. This tradition is absolutely authoritative because "the churches have it from the apostles, the apostles from Christ and Christ from God." The teaching which the apostles received from Christ they handed on to the churches both orally and in writing; the whole body of this teaching, both oral and written, is tradition. Therefore the apostolic tradition is objectively identified with what the Church is teaching at any moment of her history. In this sense we may say that Tertullian identifies apostolic and ecclesiastical tradition. Matters of discipline as well as matters of doctrine belong to this tradition; both *doctrina* and *disciplina* must be accepted, because both are subject-matter of revelation.

Ecclesiastical tradition may also be understood in a broader sense as referring to ecclesiastical customs, liturgical practices, matters of Christian conduct and observance which have been in the Church for a long period of time, but for which no written authorization can be cited. These are ecclesiastical *traditiones*, or *traditiones non scriptae*. They are described in considerable detail in chapters 3 and 4 of the *De corona*, where Tertullian insists that many of the practices connected with the administration of the sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist are obligatory in the Christian churches, in spite of the fact that their only authorization is in oral tradition. Tertullian has been held responsible for introducing this second sense of "tradition" into

the Church, and for thus having originated the distinction between *traditio* and *traditiones*, between apostolic and ecclesiastical tradition, which is still a source of confusion in Protestant-Catholic conversations. Whether Tertullian considers that the *traditiones* are independent of the *traditio* – and, if so, to what extent they are independent – may still be debated, particularly with reference to his views on the teaching authority of the Church and his understanding of what later theologians have called active and passive tradition, or *traditio subjectiva* and *objectiva*.

Controversies of the past four hundred years make it difficult for us to consider the problem of tradition in relation to exomologesis as it might have appeared to a theologian of the year 200. If Tertullian had been asked: "Why should a Christian, who has sinned after Baptism, practice exomologesis?" he would have answered very simply: "Because it is part of the Christian discipline." Exomologesis belongs to the *disciplina Christiana*, and *disciplina* has the support of both Scripture and tradition. That exomologesis belongs to Christian discipline is stated explicitly in the *De paenitentia* and *De pudicitia*. That Christian discipline has the support of Scripture and apostolic tradition is obvious from Tertullian's concept of *disciplina* as divine instruction in the practical order. We may say, then, in general, that Tertullian finds warrant for the practice of exomologesis in the fact that God Himself has revealed this practice to the Church through Christ and the apostles. Whether the divine instruction comes to men from Scripture and tradition as distinct founts of revelation was not a question with which Tertullian was concerned in discussing the special discipline of exomologesis. The teaching found contemporaneously in the apostolic churches was apostolic tradition, and this itself supports his demand for *paenitentia secunda* and his claims for its efficacy in restoring to Christians the gifts which they had first received in Baptism and which they subsequently lost by serious sin.

The *paenitentia secunda* described by Tertullian is essentially an excommunication penance, at least to the extent that it excluded sinful Christians from the reception of the Eucharist, and required their segregation in an *ordo paenitentium*. It has its Scriptural justification, first of all, in the Old Testament notion of the Hebrew community as a *Heilsgemeinschaft*. The people of God are the friends of God. The sinner cuts himself off from

| - - -

this friendship, and his offense calls down the divine anger not only upon himself but also upon all who condone his sin by continuing to live in communion with him. Only when he expiates his sin is he restored to the friendship of God and the community. Thus the Hebrew concept of the social consequences of sin gives rise to the practice of excommunication. Rabbinic literature reveals that the practice was well established in the Jewish community during the first century A. D., and there is evidence, also, that it was known and used at Qumran. In this religious and historical context the New Testament practice of excommunication developed, and subsequently, the public penance which Tertullian describes. It is a religious phenomenon, justified by divine revelation, and not merely an ecclesiastical prescription manifesting the natural concern which all societies have to preserve their identity and purity by expelling unworthy members from their ranks.

That Tertullian was aware of the Scriptural justification for the practice of excommunication is clearly indicated in a whole row of texts which he cites in his treatises on penitence, from both the Old and the New Testament — notably, Isaiah, the Psalms, St. Paul, repeatedly, and St. John. It is, of course, well known that in the Montanist treatise *De pudicitia* he restricts the power of the Church to restore excommunicated sinners to her ranks. In the pre-Montanist *De paenitentia* no such restriction is found. One must not conclude from this, however, that the public penance described in the *De pudicitia* is an excommunication penance, whereas the exomologesis of the *De paenitentia* is not. Although Tertullian nowhere uses the word "exomologesis" in the *De pudicitia*, the excommunication penance there referred to is clearly identified with the exomologesis described in the *De paenitentia*. The power to absolve *peccata capitalia* is denied, but apart from this, the essential features of the penitential process remain the same.

Tertullian's exegesis of the parables of mercy is particularly striking, and illustrates his conviction that the practice of exomologesis, precisely as an excommunication penance, has its foundation in Scripture and, therefore, in apostolic tradition. The contrasting interpretation given these parables in the *De paenitentia* and *De pudicitia* merely serves to point up the contrast between the willingness of the orthodox Christian churches to pardon all sin after public expiation, and the fanaticism of the

Montanists who refused to do so. In the earlier treatise the lost sheep and the prodigal son are taken as types of the sinner, separated from the faithful by sin, and restored to communion by *paenitentia secunda*. In the Montanist tract, Tertullian attempts to show that these parables have no application to Christians who have been guilty of the *peccata capitalia*. It is his contention, as a follower of the new prophecy, that the parables refer to the salvation of infidels, and that even if they are taken as referring to the forgiveness of Christians, they must be understood as justifying ecclesiastical pardon for lesser sins and not for those which bring death to the soul, such as adultery and fornication.

This same Montanist viewpoint is revealed in Tertullian's reading of the classic text — Matthew 16.18. In *De pudicitia* 21 he asks his opponent, the author of the Edict of Toleration against which he is protesting: "Where do you get this right which you claim for your Church? If it is because the Lord said to Peter: 'Upon this rock I will build my Church: I have given you the keys of the kingdom of heaven' (or) 'Whatsoever you shall bind or loose on earth will be bound or loosed in heaven' then you presume that the power of binding and loosing has devolved upon you also, that is, upon every church which is descended from Peter. Who are you to pervert and to change completely the manifest will of Christ, who grants this to Peter personally?" Absolution is recognized in the Christian churches as the natural *terminus* of exomologesis. The episcopal author of the *Edictum peremptorium* states categorically: "*Paenitentia functis delicta dimitto*. I forgive the sins of those who have done penance." Quite clearly Tertullian's opponents found Scriptural justification for this power to absolve after excommunication in the text of St. Matthew's gospel. As a Montanist, Tertullian rejected this interpretation of the text; whether he would have accepted it before his defection can only be a matter of conjecture. The important contrast in this chapter of the *De pudicitia* between *potestas* and *disciplina* has been studied frequently; the investigation bears on the problem of the present paper, but it cannot be considered here.

We may say, in conclusion, that according to Tertullian, the *paenitentia secunda* of exomologesis, no less than the *paenitentia prima* of Baptism, has its justification in apostolic tradition, and not merely in ecclesiastical custom. This apostolic tradition is found in both Scripture and the teaching of the apostolic

churches. Exomologesis was, in some sense, an excommunication penance. Implicit in this penance, at least in so far as it was performed by a repentant sinner, were such essential elements as the acknowledgement or confession that one had sinned, public expiation of guilt by penitential acts, and the restoration of the sinner to the life of grace in the Church by the granting of *pax* and *communio*. Ecclesiastical *traditiones* may well have accounted for further specifications of these essential elements in such developments as the *paenitentia ad limen*, along with the fasts and prostrations and penitential garb and petitions for pardon which Tertullian describes as features of exomologesis. Tertullian does not distinguish *traditio* and *traditiones* when treating of exomologesis, but it seems logical to conclude that he would apply the distinction here also, in view of what he has written elsewhere about the *paenitentia prima* of Baptism. Apostolic tradition gives us the sacrament of Baptism, but the use of milk and honey in the administration of the sacrament is justified, not by the written evidence of Scripture, but rather by "the law of custom which flows from tradition." Similarly, apostolic tradition gives us the *paenitentia secunda* of exomologesis, but the manner of confessing one's guilt, the nature of the expiatory acts which are performed, the ritual for reconciling the sinner to the Church and so to God, may all have been determined by "the custom which flows from tradition."

To what extent exomologesis, as practiced by the churches in the year 200, represents a development beyond the excommunication described in the New Testament, it would be difficult now to say. It must be acknowledged that there is no immediate prospect of reconciling conflicting views as to what is essential – and therefore immutable – in the *paenitentia secunda* which apostolic tradition has given us, and what is only accidental, what is explicit and what is implicit. It is to be hoped, however, that further consideration of this question may have some ecumenical value in illustrating, once again, that the real problem in the Protestant-Catholic dialogue today is not in reconciling the supposedly rival claims of Scripture and tradition, but rather in arriving at a mutually acceptable theory to explain and justify the divergent developments, both doctrinal and disciplinary, which have *de facto* occurred in the one tradition which "the churches have from the apostles, the apostles from Christ, and Christ from God".

Proverbs and Puns in Palladius' *Historia Lausiaca*

R. T. MEYER, Washington

One of the proofs adduced for the Palladian authorship of both the *Lausiac History* and the *Dialogus de Vita Sancti Joannis Chrysostomi* has been his use of proverbs¹. Dom Cuthbert Butler had identified the first two of these in his critical edition of the *History* (II. 201f.) and suggested a third. The first (*H. L.* 25.5), τὰ ἐναρτία τοῖς ἐναρτίοις λάματα, “Diseases are cured by their opposites”, goes back to Hippocrates: ἐνὶ δὲ συντόμῳ λόγῳ τὰ ἐναρτία τῶν ἐναρτίων ἔστιν ίῆματα (*Περὶ Φυσῶν*, 1). This was very popular with the patristic writers in dealing with vices, curing a vice by application of the opposite virtue. So St. Jerome used it in the Preface to the letter to Algasia (*Epist.* 121, PL 22: 1007 D), correctly ascribing it to Hippocrates, and after him a chain of Latin writers to the time of St. Bernard, “Last of the Fathers”. To the material quoted in Butler, *ibid.* may be added St. John Damascene, *Homiliae in Dormitionem Beatae Virginis Mariae*, II. 19 (PG 96: 752 B). The Syriac version of Palladius reads: “Each opposing sickness must be healed by medicines which are contrary and opposite thereto.” In the *Apophthegmata Patrum* the Holy Syncletica said: “Animal’s poison is cured by still stronger antidote. So fasting and prayer drive sordid temptation from the soul.”²

Another proverb (*H. L.* 26. 4) “as the saying goes, ‘drive out a nail with a nail’”, τὸ δὴ λεγόμενον ἥλω τὸν ἥλον ἔξεκρουσε, has good classical precedent, being quoted as a proverb by Aristotle, *Politics* V. ix. 5 [1314a 5]: ἥλω γὰρ ὁ ἥλος ὀσπερ ἡ παροιμία, and in Lucian, *Pro Lapsu inter Salutandum*, 7. But the Syriac version has it: “even as it is said, ‘one good is rooted up by another . . .’” I have searched in vain to find the source

¹ Classical Philology 21, 1926, 159.

² O. Chadwick, Western Asceticism, 1958, p. 55.

of Dom Butler's third proverb, "dear is truth", *φιλή δὲ η ἀληθεία*, *H. L.* (26.2).

The phrase *τὸ δὴ λεγόμενον* has been used by Palladius to introduce a proverb, or a title of a book (*H. L.* 38. 10): *τρεῖς βιβλία ιερὰ μοναχῶν ἀντιρρητικὰ οὕτω λεγόμενα* (three holy books for monks, called the Antirrhetica). So likewise it is used to introduce the phrase *σπόγγος τῆς μονῆς*, 'the sponge of the monastery', in *H. L.* 34.1, the appellation of the nun who feigned madness, who cleaned off the tables in the refectory of the nuns' monastery and lived only on the crumbs she found there. The Syriac version says: "she became the broom of the whole community." The meaning of both is pretty clear and could well have been a proverb.

What certainly looks like a proverb occurs in *H. L.* 19.6: *ἄσπερ γὰρ κύων ἐν μακέλλῳ*, "dog in a butcher's shop", and a checking of the representative proverb collections turns up a similar phrase *κύων ἐπὶ φάτνῃ*¹ in Suidas, a tag upon which a tale of Aesop or Babrius might well be hung. The Syriac version enlarges upon this: "... even as a dog which [cometh] continually to the cook, and if a man give him nothing he will not go there again" (Budge, II. 216).

Paul the Simple is said to have preferred "pasturing scorpions" (feeding himself to scorpions) to living with an adulterous woman. The term *σκορπίους ποιμάναι* (*H. L.* 22.7) could well be a take-off on the Scriptural *ποιμανεῖ ἀνέμους* in Prov. ix. 12 (LXX) quoted in *H. L.* 58.5, rendered by Hervet *pastor ventorum*. In *Dial.* 53 a proverb from Menander is quoted immediately preceding a quotation from Prov. xxvi. 22 and on the same page a saying, probably from Pythagoras, is mentioned as a proverb (*τὸ γνωμικόν*).

When we come to the puns in Palladius we are standing upon more firm ground². At the very beginning of the dedicatory letter to Lausus the author mentions that while others are building material things of stones (*λιθοὺς οἰκοδομούντων*) Lausus desires to be taught the words of true edification (*λόγονς οἰκοδομῆς*). The play on the word *οἰκοδομέω*, *to construct a house, build*, follows Latin *aedificare* in its semantic development *to build character, to edify* (in the English sense of the word

¹ Cf. Coptic Evang. Thomae 102.

² On puns in the Church Fathers, cf. Leo Spitzer, *Linguistics and Literary History*, Princeton, 1948, p. 21, 35–36.

now). The whole spirit of the *Lausiac History* is directed against the *lithomania* of the Greeks, the madness for erecting great ecclesiastical edifices once the Peace of Constantine was declared.

In the Prologue (8), itself modelled on the Prologue of St. Luke's Gospel, the play on the words: *Φιλοπραγμοσύνας, πολυπραγμοσύναι, κακοπραγμοσύναι, καλοπραγμοσύνην, ιδιοπραγμοσύνης* can hardly be carried over into English¹. The καλο- /κακο- pun is found again in the play on the words *καλόγηρος* and *κακόγηρος*. *καλόγηρος*, *venerable* applied at first apparently only to the older senior monks as a term of respect, becomes the Byzantine Greek word for *monk*, hence French *caloyer*, “a Greek monk”. Paul the Simple (22.11) exorcises a demon at the behest of St. Antony. He is addressed as *κακόγηρα*, *bad old man, old rogue* instead of *καλόγηρα*, *monk, reverend*, by the possessed victim. Variant readings *φαγόγηρε*, *old glutton of a man* attested in some manuscripts account for the Syriac version which says: “thou who eatest white bread”. Macarius of Alexandria (18.26) was over one hundred years old and toothless and was tempted to eat more than his usual allowance. He is reported by Palladius to have upbraided himself, calling himself *κακόγηρε* “bad old rogue of a man”.

What amounts to the most humorous passage in the entire *Lausiac History* is the play on words taking place between John of Lycopolis and Palladius. Palladius is supposed to have visited John and was given good advice. Finally John turned to him and asked (35.10): “Do you wish to become a bishop (*ἐπίσκοπος*)?” Palladius answered: “But I already am a bishop², for I oversee (*ἐπισκοπῶ αὐτά*) the kitchens, the shops, the tables, and even the pots. If the wine is bad I excommunicate it (*οἰνάριον δξινὸν ἀφορίζω*). If anything be lacking I season it properly and then eat it. This is my bishopric, for gluttony ordained me.” (*αὐτή μου ἐστιν ἡ ἐπισκοπή, ἔχειροτόνησε γάρ με ἡ γαστριμαργία*). “Then he smiled and said to me: ‘Stop your punning’ (*ἄφες τὰ παίγνια*).”

¹ Cf. *Studia Patristica I*, 1957, 46; S. Linnér, *Syntaktische und lexikalische Studien zur Historia Lausiacorum des Palladios*, Uppsala, 1943, p. 110.

² For a similar usage, cf. *Dialogus* ed. P. R. Coleman-Norton, Cambridge, 1928, p. 55,9–10: *θεός γάρ ὁ ἐπισκοπῶν ἡ θεώμενος ἐστιν τὰ πάντα* ‘God is the overseer and beholder of all things.’

These puns do not readily admit of translation. But we couldn't resist a punning translation of *μῆσος* (68.3) in the story of the nameless compassionate monk who lived in the city and looked after people in need. One night he came across a woman in child-birth in the porch of the church. Finding no other help at hand, this good man assisted as midwife, "not at all squeamish about the attendant *mess* in the parturition" (*οὐ βδελνξάμενος τὸ παρακολούθοντ μῆσος ταῖς τικτούσαις*).

Corrections «anciennes» et «modernes» dans le Sanctgall. 914 de la règle de Saint Benoît

A. MUNDÓ, O. S. B. Montserrat

La nouvelle édition critique de la Règle Bénédictine¹, la relation entre celle-ci et la Règle du Maître, les doutes qui ont été émis récemment sur le soit-disant «autographe»², ainsi que l'examen direct et approfondi du codex 914 de Saint-Gall³, nous permettront, je l'espère, de faire le point sur la valeur réelle de ce fameux manuscrit, considéré jusqu'ici comme le seul descendant authentique du texte original. On ne sera plus tenu, pro-

¹ Due à R. Hanslik, *Sancti Benedicti Regula*, CSEL, 75, Vindobonae 1960. — Les sigles suivantes employées ici sont tirées d'une étude que paraîtra, Dieu aidant et prochainement, à Oslo (voir pour l'instant, *Revue Bénédictine* 71, 1961, 391): Ω = «autographe» sur feuilles volantes ou *schedae* non conservées; Ψ = archetypus de: Ψ^1 = copie du VI^e s., censée autographe, brûlée au IX^e siècle, et d'où dérivent indirectement les mss K; Ψ^2 = copie directe de Ψ^1 , envoyée du Mont-Cassin à Charlemagne après 787, et sur laquelle a été copié le ms A. Elle a influencé BC, G₁₋₄ et D. A = archétype imparfaitement conservé dans trois mss italiens, et qui a influencé Φ et K. Π = archétype perdu, à reconstituer d'après: Σ = subarchétype des mss soit-disant «interpolés», et Φ = subarchétype d'origine wisigothique narbonnais. α = corrections marginales de A = ms. Saint-Gall 914. B = Vienne N. B. 2232. C = Clm 28118. G₁₋₄ = quatre mss dérivés de A + α . D = Augsburg, Ordin. Bibl., l. K = mss cassiniens divers, surtout le 175. X = ms. Cassin. 499. En plus, RB = *Regula Benedicti*; RM = *Regula Magistri*.

² Voir les pp. XV–XVI et XXIII–XXVI de l'introduction à l'éd. de Hanslik. Depuis longtemps déjà on s'en doutait; voir C. Butler, *S. Benedicti Regula* 3^e éd., 1935, p. XIX–XX; Linderbauer, *S. Bened. Reg.*, 2^e éd., 1928, p. 2; S. Brechter, *Zum authentischen Titel der Reg. S. Benedicti*, *Studien und Mitteilungen* 55, 1937, 162 n. 22; Ch. Mohrmann, *La latinité de S. Benoît*, *Rev. Bén.* 62, 1952, 109; F. Massai et moi-même au Congrès de Spolète de 1956, voir *Il monachesimo nell'alto medioevo*, IV settimana di studi, Spoleto 1957, 438–471. Voir encore E. Dekkers, *Les autographes des Pères latins*, *Colligere fragmenta*, *Festschrift A. Dold*, Beuron 1952, p. 127–139.

³ Le 914 n'a été étudié ni dans B. Bischoff, *Die südostdeutschen Schreibschulen und Bibliotheken in der Karolingerzeit*, I *Die bayrischen Diözesen*, Leipzig 1940, ni dans A. Bruckner, *Scriptoria Medii Aevi Helvetica*, Génève 1935 ss., peut-être parce qu'écrit hors de la Bavière et de la Suisse actuelles.

bablement, de lui vouer cette vénération exclusive qui lui a été acquise depuis Traube, et qui pouvait paraître consacrée avec la récente édition de Hanslik.

Quoiqu'elle soit assez connue, je suis obligé de répéter ici l'histoire du codex de Saint-Gall. Vers 820, deux moines de Reichenau, Grimalt et Tattu, se rendirent à Inda, près d'Aix-la-Chapelle, pour y étudier sur place la réforme introduite par Benoît d'Aniane. Ils prirent une copie de l'exemplaire normal de RB et l'envoyèrent à Reginbert, bibliothécaire de leur abbaye. Dans la lettre d'envoi — on ne peut pas douter de ce qu'ils raccontent¹ —, ils s'expliquaient sur le soin extrême apporté à leur travail; voici le passage principal:

Ecce vobis regulam b. Benedicti (...) direximus, sensibus et sillabis necnon etiam litteris a supra dicto patre ni fallimur ordinatis minime carentem: quae de illo transcripta est exemplare, quod ex illo exemplatum est codice, quem beatus pater sacris manibus suis exarare (...) curavit. Illa ergo verba, quae supra dictus pater secundum artem, sicut nonnulli autumant, in contextum regulae huius non inseruit, de aliis regulis a modernis correctis magistris collectimus et in campo paginulae e regione cum duobus punctis inserere curavimus: alia autem, quae a Benedicto dictata sunt et in neotericis minime inventa, oboelo et punctis duobus consignavimus. Hoc egimus, desiderantes vos utrumque et secundum traditionem pii patris etiam modernam habere. Eligite vobis quod desiderabili placuerit animo².

Depuis Traube tout le monde admettait que le manuscrit actuel 914 de Saint-Gall, notre A, est la copie même effectuée par les deux moines de Reichenau. Hanslik n'est pas de cet avis³. Pour lui, A est une copie postérieure du manuscrit envoyé à Reginbert. Il donne comme raisons: d'abord que le manuscrit de Saint-Gall est de la main d'un seul et même copiste, tandis que l'exemplaire de Reichenau était l'œuvre des deux moines; ensuite, qu'il est peu probable que les moines de Reichenau aient cédé à ceux de Saint-Gall le précieux exemplaire envoyé d'Inda; ils en auront plutôt fait prendre une copie aussi fidèle que possible; enfin, que le manuscrit de Saint-Gall donne l'impression d'être la reproduction quasi-photographique du modèle de

¹ Comme je le dirai, l'examen codicologique du ms. 914 montre que ses cahiers centrales — où se trouve transcrise cette lettre — ont été copiés sous l'ordre de Grimalt, devenu abbé de Saint-Gall, après 842.

² Traube, Textgeschichte der Reg. S. Benedicti, 2^e éd., de H. Plenkers, München 1910, p. 90.

³ Dans l'édition, p. XXV—XXIX.

Reichenau; or, si celui-ci avait présenté le même caractère «photographique» à l'égard de son modèle d'Inda, Grimalt et Tattó n'auraient pas manqué d'en avertir Reginbert.

Même en oubliant le regret d'une allusion anachronique aux procédés photographiques, aucune de ces raisons ne me paraît décisive. Après examen attentif du ms., ni l'histoire, ni la paléographie, ni le texte-même de *A* ne s'opposent, à mon avis, à ce que le ms. actuel de Saint-Gall ne soit bien l'œuvre commune des deux moines. Quoique à première vue l'écriture de *A* paraisse d'une main unique¹, on peut concilier ceci en mettant en avant diverses hypothèses: peut être l'un des deux moines écrivait-il ce que l'autre lui dictait; plus probablement, l'un (supposons que c'était Grimalt, parce que le premier nommé) effectua la copie, laissant à l'autre (Tattó) le soin de la revoir, de la corriger, de la compléter avec titres et notes marginales. Il est sûr que quelque bout de page est d'une main différente (f. 4 et 75 = «74»); plusières notes marginales primitives n'appartiennent pas non plus à la main du texte. Ainsi, on peut parler encore de travail en équipe.

Je n'y insisterai plus ici. Mais je peux avancer qu'on a maintenant la preuve paléographique que le 914 a été écrit par des moines de Reichenau et certainement vers 820. Les mains anciennes du 914 se retrouvent identiques dans des mss de Reichenau conservés surtout à Karlsruhe². Le 914 est décrit manifestement dans les deux premiers catalogues de Reichenau du bibliothécaire Reginbert, de 821 et c. 842. Il contient à la fin un nécrologie non pas sanctgallais mais d'Augiae Divitis³! Il n'a

¹ Traube, *Textgeschichte*, p. 50. Je n'ose concéder trop d'importance à des changements visibles dans l'inclinaison de la plume de ce scribe assez exercé, qui entraînèrent un agrandissement du format de l'écriture; ainsi que non plus à une petite évolution dans l'emploi, irrégulier d'ailleurs, d'un certain nombre d'abréviations et de liaisons. Ces changements s'expliquent par le fait d'être une copie qui a pu durer quelques semaines, avec des reprises faisant suite à des arrêts plus ou moins longs.

² J'ai pu en examiner un grand nombre du IX^e siècle, avec des résultats positifs pour les Aug. LXIX, LXXII, LXXVII, LXXXI, LXXXV, LXXXVII, XCII, XCIX, CIII, CLV, CLXXXII, CXCI, CCXXI. Encore, les mss Oxford, Bodl. Junius 25, Leyden, Voss. lat., Q. 5, et S. Paul in Kärnten, 25.4.9a, tous de Reichenau et très semblables au 914, voir quelque fois des mêmes mains anciennes qui y ont intervenu.

³ La copie la plus ancienne du 914 avec ses notes marginales inserées dans le texte a été prise à Reichenau (Karlsruhe, Aug. CXXVIII), tandis que d'autres l'ont été peu après à Saint-Gall.

changé de monastère qu'au moment où son copiste, Grimalt de Reichenau, devient abbé de Saint-Gall en 842¹.

Il faut avertir cependant que les cahiers centraux du ms. 914 ont été copiés sur d'autres plus anciens par des mains sanct-gallaises travaillant vers le milieu du IX^e siècle. Les raisons de cette substitution m'échappent pour l'instant. Si on a coupé les feuillets contenant les *hymni ambrosiani* du recueil primitif, on y a ajouté quelques textes législatifs monastiques importants. Parmi ces additions on y voit la fameuse lettre de Grimalt et Tattu à Régimbert rapportée au début. Si elle était d'abord dans une feuille volante et en possession de Régimbert, quoi de plus normal que de la faire recopier dans le recueil que Grimalt apportait avec lui à Saint-Gall?

Le ms. A présente de nombreuses corrections apportées par des mains différentes. Il n'est pas toujours facile de discerner ces différences de mains². Je me suis efforcé d'en distinguer l'âge; ce qu'on parvient à faire aisément par l'examen de l'encre, de la façon d'exécuter les grattages, ainsi que des circonstances de la correction. Ici je ne parlerai plus des corrections récentes, c'est-à-dire, de celles postérieures à l'époque de la copie du ms. Si l'on s'en tient aux données sûres, les corrections originales peuvent être réparties en trois classes. La première comprend celles que l'on peut appeler «modernes»: ce sont celles apportées par les deux moines eux-mêmes, corrigéant leur propre copie d'après leur modèle Ψ^2 . Elles consistent essentiellement en des grattages destinés à faire place le plus souvent à une surcharge. A ce stade de correction déjà deux mains originales sont intervenues quelque 150 fois.

¹ Ce qui plus est, à la date où a été transcrit le 914 il n'est pas question à Saint-Gall de ce type d'écriture régulière des mss Augienses; peut-être elle n'a pénétré à Saint-Gall qu'après 835, avec l'abbé Gozbert, et plus probablement après 842 avec l'abbé Grimalt.

² Tous les auteurs les ont notées; cf. H. Plenkers, Untersuchungen zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der ältesten lateinischen Mönchregeln, p. 33–37, et surtout dans Neue Ausgabe und Übersetzungen der Benediktinerregel, Stud. und Mitteil. 47 (1929) 187. Pour les diverses opinions sur les mains correctrices de A voir Traube, Textgeschichte, p. 50; Morin, dans l'édition diplomatique, Mont-Cassin 1900, p. XXII; Scherer, Verzeichnis der Handschriften der Stiftsbibliothek St. Gallen. Hanslik diffère assez souvent de Morin dans l'appréciation des mains correctrices. Je donne volontiers la raison à Hanslik puisqu'il a pu revoir soigneusement la transcription de Morin sur le ms., en s'aidant aussi des remarques de Plenkers.

La deuxième classe comprend les corrections qui se trouvaient dans le modèle Ψ^2 lui-même; elles auraient été reproduites avec soin par Grimalt et Tattó¹. En effet, le ms. Ψ^2 devait comporter déjà des corrections consistant surtout en exponctuations et en lettres écrites au dessus de la ligne, ainsi qu'en des renvois aux marges quand la correction était trop longue. On peut appeler ces corrections «anciennes», c'est-à-dire, suivant le système qu'on employait jusqu'à l'époque de la basse romanité. On en compte dans *A* à peu près 70. Ce sont telles, sans doute, que visent les deux copistes lorsqu'ils écrivent à Régimbert: *sensibus et syllabis necnon etiam litteris a supra dicto patre ni fallimur ordinatis minimi carentem.*

Les corrections qui forment la troisième classe sont plutôt des annotations marginales munies de signes de renvoi. Elles supposent l'intervention d'un recenseur grammairien qui a confronté le texte avec d'autres manuscrits de RB, et qui a reporté sur sa copie les variantes de ceux-ci. Les mots, les syllabes et les lettres qui donnent lieu à des variantes sont encadrées de deux points : ∴. Si ces éléments de *A* manquaient dans les autres mss, ils sont signalés par un obèle ∵. Quant aux variantes positives, elles sont consignées dans la marge. Ce procédé d'édition critique était bien connu aussi des anciens; mais au Nord des Alpes il n'était pratiquement plus en usage au début de l'époque carolingienne². Si donc nous constatons sa présence dans le ms. de Saint-Gall, lequel est du premier quart du IX^e siècle, c'est parce que cet apparat marginal a été recueilli d'un exemplaire plus ancien établi à une époque où dans un endroit où le procédé était encore connu. Il en résulte une forte présomption en faveur de l'hypothèse que ces annotations des *neoterici* se trouvaient déjà dans Ψ^2 , copié en Italie³.

On devine déjà l'intérêt de la présence dans *A* des corrections «anciennes» de la seconde et troisième classe, leur interprétation devant différer de celles des grattages ou «modernes». Certes, il

¹ Plenkers, Neue Ausgabe, p. 186, s'en doutait déjà.

² Traube, Textgeschichte, p. 75–77 (voir la note additionnelle de Plenkers à la p. 77), le confirmerait avec ses observations.

³ C'est l'opinion aussi de E. Franceschini, dans la discussion qui suivit à sa conférence de Spolète (voir la citation de la note 2, p. 424 du volume). Je n'oserais être si affirmatif que ne l'a été Mohrmann, La latinité de S. Benoit. Rev. Bén. 62, 1952, 118, qui voit, dans les corrections des marges de *A*, des adaptations à l'orthographe carolingienne.

n'est pas toujours facile de distinguer nettement les corrections de la seconde classe, c'est-à-dire celles qui figuraient déjà dans Ψ^2 , et les annotations critiques qui forment la troisième classe, une même main ayant transcrit assez souvent, à ce qu'il semble, les unes et les autres. Cependant, dans certains cas il est possible de faire ce partage, et cela grâce aux manuscrits qui, tout comme *A*, dérivent de Ψ^2 de quelque manière que ce soit. Ce sont surtout les mss *B* et *C*. Nous constatons que leurs copistes ont, en général, accepté les corrections de la première et de la seconde classe, tandis qu'ils n'ont pas fait état des annotations de la troisième, qu'ils croyaient l'œuvre des *neoterici*. Il ne faudrait pas induire de cette dernière omission que les variantes marginales de α ne figuraient pas dans Ψ^2 : les copistes les auront négligées par principe, ne les admettant qu'au cas où Ψ^2 n'aurait pas offert de sens correct¹. A noter enfin que le manuscrit *D*, bien qu'indépendant de *A* + α , présente néanmoins plusieurs variantes propres aux *neoterici*; comment l'expliquer si ces corrections savantes ne se trouvaient déjà dans Ψ^2 ?

D'où proviennent donc les variantes marginales de *A* + α ? A en croire Grimalt et Tattò, ils les auraient recueillies eux-mêmes de différents exemplaires de la Règle. Leur déclaration est formelle: *de aliis regulis a modernis correctis magistris collectimus, et in campo paginulae e regione . . . inserere curavimus*. Mais les deux moines n'exagèrent-ils pas leur zèle? On peut conceder que certaines variantes ont été effectivement relevées par eux; mais ils donnent eux-mêmes à entendre qu'un certain nombre avaient été déjà collectées avant eux *a modernis magistris*, et qu'ils les avaient trouvées groupées, sans doute dans les marges de Ψ^2 . Hanslik fait à ce sujet des observations suggestives²: une partie des variantes de *A* + α provient de la tradition Φ ; une autre, bien caractéristique, est proprement italienne puisqu'on en trouve les éléments dans les cassiniens *K* et *X*, et dans *A*. On peut donc supposer que le groupe italien des variantes est dû à un érudit

¹ Tout autre sera la méthode des copistes des quatre mss *G*₁₋₄, qui avaient sous les yeux le ms. même de Saint-Gall: ils ont accepté intégralement les trois classes de corrections figurant dans *A*, ayant adopté le critère de la *traditio moderna* indiquée dans la lettre de Grimalt et Tattò.

² Édit. critique, p. XXIX et LVIII. Il reste encore vrai cependant ce que disait dom Brechter, Zum authentischen Titel, p. 122 note 271, que ces notes devraient être examinées de plus près.

italien, vraisemblablement un moine du Cassin, Paul Diacre peut-être¹.

Le copiste de *A* a eu manifestement l'intention d'imiter son modèle jusque dans la mise en page. Hanslik s'en est bien rendu compte. Mais il dénie à Grimalt et Tatto la même préoccupation devant Ψ^2 , leur propre modèle. Cependant, les deux moines de Reichenau, qui insistent tellement dans leur lettre d'envoi sur la fidélité scrupuleuse à reproduire l'exemplaire d'Aix-la-Chapelle, étaient bien capables de pousser ce soin jusqu'à imiter la disposition matérielle des pages, des lignes et des glosses marginales. De nombreux indices, d'ailleurs, rendent manifeste leur souci de reproduction servile : intervalles inégaux entre les mots ; signes diacritiques entre les syllabes sciemment espacées ; syllabes écrites à la fin d'une ligne, puis grattées et reportées au début de la ligne suivante, avec décalage de l'éventuelle leçon marginale correspondante². Ce dernier fait est un nouvel indice, me semble-t-il, de la présence d'un lot important de variantes des *neoterici* de *A* + α dans Ψ^2 .

¹ Brechter, Zum authentischen Titel, p. 221–223, nie sans preuves suffisantes, que ces marginalia aient été déjà dans Ψ^2 , certes sans connaître ce que l'on sait maintenant sur son origine. Brechter avertit d'ailleurs fort justement que Grimalt et Tatto n'avaient pas la formation suffisante pour remplir le rôle de grammairiens recenseurs. Toute son argumentation tend à prouver — à mon avis, sans y parvenir — que les mss K (le 175 en première ligne) dépendent quelques 100 fois des interpolations introduites dans l'empire franc. De ce qui vient d'être dit, on voit que le contraire est plus probable, et que l'observation de Hanslik ajoute du poids à l'opinion traditionnelle. — La concordance des marginalia α avec RM, — qui a reçu la double explication : RM dépendrait de RB déjà interpolée (C. Lambot, dans Rev. Bén. 51, 1939, 139–143; E. Franceschini, RB, Neoterici magistri, RM, dans Liber Floridus. Mittel-lateinische Studien Paul Lehmann . . . gewidmet, St. Ottilien 1950, p. 94–119, et avec nouvelles précisions dans Aevum 25, 1951, 289–304; P. Blanchard, La RM et la RB, Rev. Bén. 60, 1950, 59–60), ou bien : RM aurait influé sur les interpolés de RB (H. Vanderhoven, RM statistiques et mss, Scriptorum 3, 1949, 246–248; G. Penco, La RM e la storia testuale della RB, Studia Anselmiana 44, 1959, 85–106), doit être expliquée d'après le principe de l'indépendance des archetypes *II* et *A* en face de Ψ , qui permet de dire que les soit-disant interpolés, plus proches de RM, ont conservé parfois la leçon primitive de RB.

² Si l'on admet qu'une partie des notes marginales sont du même scribe qui a copié le texte, la difficulté tirée de la double correction au f. 32 ligne 17 (Hanslik, éd. critique, p. XXVIII), et d'autres semblables, ne peuvent être plus présentées contre la paternité de Grimalt et Tatto sur *A*; mais, au contraire, plutôt la démontrent.

La lettre de Théodemar à Charlemagne¹ nous apprend que Ψ^2 a été copié au Mont-Cassin, après 787, puis envoyé à Aix-la-Chapelle. On pense généralement, à la suite de Traube², que Paul Diacre ne fut pas étranger à cette transcription. Son intervention serait une garantie de soin et d'exactitude, pareille à celle des deux copistes de *A* sur Ψ^2 .

Ne l'oublions pas : c'est à travers le ms. *A* de Saint-Gall et Ψ^2 reconstitué que nous pouvons entrevoir Ψ^1 , c'est-à-dire le soit-disant autographe de saint Benoît. Avec sa compétence coutumièrre, Mlle Mohrmann a prouvé que Ψ^1 devait être du VI^e siècle, comme en témoignent tant l'orthographe que la grammaire³. Et le fait qu'au Mont-Cassin on ait pu prendre cette copie pour l'autographe ne fait que confirmer l'ancienneté de Ψ^1 . Cependant contrairement aux scribes de *A* et de Ψ^2 , dont la préoccupation première d'exactitude imitative était d'un tout autre ordre, celui de Ψ^1 n'avait pas de raison particulière de reproduire scrupuleusement les singularités orthographiques et grammaticales de son modèle.

J'espère relever ailleurs quelques cas tendant à montrer que Ψ^1 a été exécuté sous dictée. Par conséquent, ses graphies étaient influencées par l'audition. En plus d'un cas, où l'ordre des mots original de RB nous est garanti par sa source RM et par les archétypes *P* et *A*, l'ordre de Ψ^1 est différent : ce qui a dû se produire assez naturellement par l'effet de l'audition ; car il est plus facile d'intervertir l'ordre des mots lorsqu'on les entend prononcer que lorsqu'on les a sous les yeux⁴.

Allons plus loin. Quoique nous ne puissions plus juger qu'à travers le ms. de Saint-Gall, il semble que Ψ^1 fut exécuté par

¹ Édition Dummler, MGH Epist. IV p. 510; voir Traube, Textgeschichte, p. 31, et aussi p. 79 pour la date à peu près de la lettre et de l'envoi de la copie de RB : *cum 790*; Dummler, I. c. : «787–797» = mort de Théodemar.

² Textgeschichte, p. 31; Brechter, Zum authentischen Titel, p. 193 n. 164; Hanslik, Die Benediktinerregel im Wiener Kirchenvätercorpus, Studia Anselmiana 42, 1957, 166.

³ Ch. Mohrmann, La latinité de S. Benoît, Rev. Bén. 62, 1952, 108–139. Je crois rendre mieux sa pensée en appliquant ses conclusions à une copie du VI^e siècle plus qu'à la RB tout court. Mohrmann est justement très sceptique sur les traditions relatives à l'autographe.

⁴ Sur l'étendue du procédé de composition littéraire à la dictée dans l'antiquité voir le résumé des différentes opinions récentes dans H. Hoppenbrouwers, La plus ancienne version latine de la vie de s. Antoine par s. Athanase, Nimègue 1960, p. 5 et 14–17.

plusieurs scribes. En effet, à côté de certaines graphies constantes les bétacismes par exemple, il en est d'autres qui ne s'observent que dans une partie de RB¹: ainsi les assimilations *amm-* et *app-* sont plus fréquentes à partir du chapitre XX; *cottidiae*, *diabolus*, *intelligere* se lisent régulièrement dans les premières pages, *cotidie*, *diabulus*, *intelligere* dans les suivantes; les chapitres liturgiques VIII-XVIII et disciplinaires XXIII-XXX, plus exposés à des accidents à cause des termes techniques et des nombres en chaîne, pourraient appartenir à un copiste plus distrait ou moins exercé; de même le chapitre XLVIII, pour des raisons analogues².

Quoiqu'il en soit de tous ces détails, une chose semble bien acquise: Ψ^1 est un texte écrit sous dictée et, par conséquent, ses graphies ne peuvent être attribuées nécessairement à l'auteur ou au ms. original de RB.

Ici serait le moment de faire quelques remarques au sujet de certaines graphies adoptées dans la nouvelle édition critique. Hanslik très souvent reproduit les graphies anormales de A. Il a adopté, en général, les bétacismes, les aspirations, les assimilations et d'autres anomalies. Mais, en ce qui concerne d'autres particularités graphiques il a souvent abandonné A. Son choix peut paraître quelquefois arbitraire. Sans doute son ambition tendait-elle à restituer l'autographe même de saint Benoît. En vérité, cette tentative pouvait-elle être couronnée de succès?

Nous savons comment les auteurs du VI^e siècle envisageaient dans la pratique le problème de l'orthographe de leurs œuvres. Fixons d'abord la terminologie. Par orthographe on entend les règles de l'écriture fixées et codifiées par les grammairiens. La graphie, par contre, est la façon, correcte ou non, dont chacun écrit. L'orthographe latine est restée longtemps assez stable, nonobstant l'évolution continue de la langue vivante. Dans la pratique, au VI^e siècle, tandis que la morphologie et la syntaxe sont encore relativement respectées par les copistes, l'ortho-

¹ Quelques indications déjà dans Plenkers, Untersuchungen, p. 30-31.

² Je ne nie pas que certaines inégalités de style dans les diverses parties de RB doivent être mises au compte de saint Benoît en personne, ce qu'ont bien mis en relief A. Lentini, Il ritmo prosaico nella Regola di S. Benedetto, Miscellanea Cassinese 23, 1942, p. 30-33, et Ch. Mohrmann, La latinité p. 129-130; je propose simplement une autre hypothèse possible pour expliquer le phénomène de la répartition inégale des particularités graphiques et grammaticales dans Ψ .

graphie apparaît plus lache; elle devient capricieuse en passant par les mains des copistes responsables de mss d'usage publique¹. Notez bien que les scribes par le seul fait de savoir écrire ne peuvent pas être considérés comme des gens de culture; parfois ils ne savaient que mettre des lettres l'une à côté de l'autre. Par contre, on s'aperçoit en regardant les rares écritures autographes des auteurs anciens et du haut moyen age (d'ordinaire des mots ou des lignes seulement), qu'ils étaient souvent incapables de faire une belle copie; pourtant ils avaient lu plus qu'un scribe: ils étaient des gens de culture; ils soignaient leur graphie et ils pouvaient la corriger et l'adapter à l'orthographe des grammairiens. Aussi est-ce surtout en ce qui concerne l'orthographe des belles copies que les auteurs de l'époque se montrent soucieux d'éliminer les incorrections avant de lancer leur œuvre dans le public.

Nous avons la chance de posséder deux manuscrits du VI^e siècle portant des retouches autographes de l'auteur: c'est d'une part, le ms. Fulda, Landesbibliothek, Bonif. 1 (Concordance des Évangiles, de Victor de Capoue) et, de l'autre, le ms. Troyes, Bibl. Munic. 504 (Règle Pastorale de saint Grégoire). Ces deux mss, belles copies en onciale, nous offrent des exemples de ce qu'a du être l'archétype Ψ^1 de notre manuscrit A. Or, d'un bout à l'autre du *Fuldensis* on discerne la main de Victor apportant principalement des corrections orthographiques suivant les règles classiques². Il en va sensiblement de même pour le *Trecensis*³. Le système de correction suivi dans ces deux mss est précisément l'ancien, celui des obèles et des renvois en marge, ainsi que l'exponctuation des lettres à biffer ou substituer. Le vrai autographe, les *schedae* redigées entièrement de leur main, si elles ont existé, étaient destinées à disparaître dès que la belle

¹ Tel que naguère le remarquait Ph. Corbett dans l'introduction à l'édition diplomatique des mss de RM, *Les publications de Scriptorium III*, Bruxelles 1953, p. 77.

² Edit. diplomatique par E. Ranke, *Codex Fuldensis, Marburgi et Lipsiae 1868*.

³ Quoiqu'il n'est pas sûr que ses corrections soient autographes, ceci n'est pas exclu non plus; L. M. Hartmann, Über die Orthographie Papst Gregors I., Neues Archiv 15, 1890, 527–549. On se rappellera des protestes formulées contre les graphies monstrueuses introduites par Moricca dans son édition des Dialogues de saint Grégoire. Tout se passait comme si l'idéal philologique d'une édition critique était d'accumuler les horreurs graphiques des mss utilisés en les attribuant à l'auteur.

copie était finie. Pour la Règle de saint Césaire aux vierges, on en possède le témoignage formel de l'auteur¹: dans l'exemplaire définitif il a ajouté de sa main la *Recapitulatio*, après avoir détruit les *schedae* antérieures².

Le cas de la Règle bénédictine, nous en sommes sûrs, ne doit pas avoir été fort différent. Car saint Benoît n'était pas dépourvu de culture: sa règle atteste, chez lui, un sens réel de la composition littéraire³. Benoît ne devait donc pas être indifférent aux normes scolaires de l'orthographe. Certes, il est possible qu'avant tout travail de révision orthographique opéré par Benoît lui-même ou sous son contrôle, des copies aient déjà été prises: elles étaient, en effet, nécessaires dans les premières fondations pour que soit observée la prescription de la Règle elle-même voulant que celle-ci soit lue fréquemment en public. Or, ni les *schedae* de Benoît ni ces autres exemplaires mis au net ne se sont conservés, si ce n'est que les archétypes ancêtres de nos familles *II* et *A*; *Ψ* n'a que la valeur d'une de ces copies, valable certes, mais n'offrant pas toutes garanties dans certains passages, moins encore dans l'orthographe.

Pour rétablir l'orthographe originale de RB, nous n'avons pas l'avantage de posséder les corrections autographes comme c'est le cas pour Victor et Grégoire. Cependant, on peut obtenir un résultat satisfaisant, croyons-nous, par le triage minutieux, que nous avons proposé, des leçons et des graphies du manuscrit de Saint-Gall et de ses corrections anciennes. Les graphies remontent, on peut dire, en bloc, à l'archéotype *Ψ* avant la correction. Là où *A* n'est pas constant, il faut s'efforcer de dégager la tendance générale des corrections anciennes: l'éditeur moderne est alors en droit de corriger l'orthographe suivant cette directive, à condition bien entendu de laisser subsister les graphies anormales qui, revenant plus de deux fois, n'ont jamais reçu de correction: on a la chance d'y reconnaître une graphie admise comme bonne par l'auteur ou par son secrétaire. Par cette méthode sont re-

¹ Voir G. Morin, édition du *Florilegium Patristicum* 34, Bonn 1933, p. 18 note 48.

² Voir pourtant le paragraphe 5 et la note de dom Morin à ce passage de la Règle de saint Césaire.

³ Voir A. Lentini, *Il ritmo prosaico* p. 16–60 et 104–111; B. Linderbauer, *S. Benedicti Regula monachorum herausgegeben und philologisch erklärt*, Metten 1922, p. 98 et 414; Card. Ild. Schuster, *La storia di san Benedetto e dei suoi tempi*, 3^e éd., Viboldone 1953, p. 39–48.

spectées à la fois les données de la philologie et les exigences d'un fait historique nécessairement complexe. Ce faisant, on se conforme sans aucun doute aux intentions réelles de l'auteur. Il y a lieu cependant de faire connaître, en les recueillant dans un appareil spécial, toutes les graphies qui se rencontrent dans les mss, car elles permettront aux philologues de suivre, comme à la trace, l'évolution du langage.

Je n'ai pas l'intention de traiter ici à fond du manuscrit original Ω , car il est pour ainsi dire impossible de restituer parfaitement ce tout premier exemplaire. Cependant, des observations que nous avons faites permettent de dégager quelques-uns des aspects que devait présenter Ω . Celui-ci était vraisemblablement écrit en cursive, peut-être partiellement par un secrétaire, comme c'était l'usage à l'époque. On y voyait des retouches et des additions (par exemple, je suppose en marge, la finale du Prologue) de la main-même de Benoît. C'est à un secrétaire qu'il faudrait attribuer les titres et autres éléments accessoires. Certains défauts résultant d'une rédaction un peu négligée auront échappé à la dernière révision: ainsi, quelques graphies de caractère phonétique et quelques inconséquences grammaticales ou syntaxiques. On soupçonne que les chapitres VIII–XVIII n'ont pas été composée d'un seul jet, mais rédigés dans quelque cahier indépendant.

Dans ces conditions, les premières copies, qui sont en fait nos trois archéotypes, ont du être d'une exécution difficile. Π , transcrit peut-être plus négligemment, a subi assez tôt une révision et il a donné naissance, moyennant de nouvelles retouches, aux subarchéotypes Σ et Φ . Nous ignorons pratiquement tout des conditions où fut établi l'archéotype Λ . Quant à Ψ , bien qu'il ait été exécuté sous dictée, il peut être considéré comme la copie la plus soignée; il semble avoir ensuite été confronté avec l'original, pour recevoir de retouches textuelles et des corrections, qui cependant auront laissé subsister quelques graphies populaires. Mais, notons-le encore une fois, Ψ ne représente qu'une branche de la tradition du texte de saint Benoît, probablement la dernière copie tirée de l'original.

Ces observations, ainsi que d'autres semblables (que j'espère offrir dans un ouvrage en préparation) et qui touchent les relations entre les différents archéotypes de RB, sont de nature à placer sous une lumière nouvelle le problème de l'établissement du texte de la Règle de saint Benoît.

An Approach to the Moral Theology of St. Hilary of Poitiers

F. X. MURPHY C. SS. R., Rome

It is hardly necessary to stress the importance of the contribution of a man such as St. Hilary of Poitiers (315–367) both to the formation of the Christian tradition in the mid-fourth century, and to the dialogue within Christianity now in progress. For not only did he bridge the occidental and oriental theology of his day, but he took a strong and effective stand in having the Church face up to the problems presented by the public affairs of the Empire in his day. Brevity demands that no attempt be made here to assess the value of that contribution. But what should prove of interest is an insight into the manner in which he conceived of the problem of Christian moral values on a personal level.

Conscious of the tendency to force the thinking of another age into patterns or categories either proper to a particular school, or endemic to one's own culture – what has been properly called 'parochialism in time' – it has been thought best to present an abstract of Hilary's moral thought through the medium of his commentary on Psalm 14, which by his own witness contains no prophecy: *nihil enim in tempus alterum destinatur*; nor does it conceal any mysteries: *nihil ex occultis profertur*; but as he alleges, it deals with actual facts and situations: *omne opus eius in praesens est*¹.

This claim is in contrast to Hilary's usual method of exegesis, wherein as Fr. Galtier maintains: "While he recognizes on the part of the original author some personal experience, Hilary still believes that everything the Psalmist says of himself can be applied to Christ"². Fr. Galtier further states that not infre-

¹ S. Hilarii episcopi Pictavensis, Tractatus super Psalmos, CSEL 22, ed. A. Zingerle, Vienna, 1891, 84.

² P. Galtier, S. Hilaire de Poitiers, Paris, Beauchesne et fils, 1960, 162; cf. J.-P. Brisson, Hilaire de Poitiers, Traité des Mystères, Paris, Sources Chrétienennes 19, 1947, 14–41.

quently Hilary, by means of logical ingenuity, and an arbitrary recourse to allegory, deforms his text to such a degree as to make it say the opposite of what the original writer intended. Following the principle that the "old Law" was an *umbra futurorum*¹ and a *velamentum verborum spiritualium*² Hilary as exegete functions ordinarily more as moralist and director of souls, above all else pursuing edification so that in the severe though just God of the Old Testament, his preoccupation is to discover the good and merciful God of the New Testament.

In his three main exegetical works, the *Commentarium in S. Mattheum*, the *Tractatus super Psalmos*, and the *Tractatus Mysteriorum*, Hilary deals with the main problems raised by the Christian moral doctrine. Thus he discusses man as made in the Image of God³ which has been beclouded by original sin⁴, but given the possibility of being refurbished through the Redemption and divine grace which re-establishes man's free will. For it is his *liberum arbitrium* that is the secret of man's essential nobility⁵. Hilary discusses the psychology of sin, and the salutary effect of the confession of sins without contributing to the solution of the problems raised by modern historians concerning ancient Christian practices⁶. Finally, in the introduction to the *De Trinitate* he provides us with a consideration of the process of conversion, employing what is almost certainly a literary device and not a true history of his own religious experience⁷.

In his explanation of Psalm 14 – *Domine quis habitabit in tabernaculo tuo?*⁸ – Hilary proceeds to integrate the moral requirements of both the Old and the New Testaments without observing the *caesura* supplied by the advent of Christ, and thus makes the moral obligations of both laws co-equal. He considers this Psalm as a brief, practical precept which he says, with a bow to Cicero's *Pro Archia*, can easily be memorized and serve one

¹ S. Hilarii, In Ps. 1,8: CSEL 22, 24.

² Comm. in Mt. 4,14.

³ In Ps. 134,14: CSEL 22, 702; cf. P. Wild, *Divinisation of Man according to Saint Hilary of Poitiers*, Mundelein, Ill., 1950, 137–149.

⁴ In Ps. 66,1: CSEL 22, 274–275; cf. P. Limongi, *La natura e gli effetti del peccato originale* in S. Ilario di Poitiers, *Divus Thomas*, Piacenza, 45, 1942, 186–201.

⁵ In Ps. 126,13: ib. 622; in Ps. 2,16: ib. 48.

⁶ In Ps. 137,2: ib. 735; cf. C. Vogel, *La discipline pénitentielle en Gaule des origines à la fin du VII^e siècle*, Paris, 1952.

⁷ De Trinitate, PL 10, 25–35.

⁸ In. Ps. 14: CSEL 22, 84–96.

everywhere "at home and abroad, publicly and privately, by day and by night". Since it describes the man *qui ingreditur sine macula et operatur justitiam*, it is a summation of all that is required in prosecuting the ascent toward God – the *iter ad Deum* – which will eventuate in eternal rest. Despite its brevity, it is a distillation of the "rich and infinite precepts of the Old and New Testaments proper for children as well as for men and women"¹.

Despite his original disclaimer, Hilary immediately proceeds to an allegorical interpretation of the verse *quis habitarit in tabernaculo tuo* by stating that the tents or huts which Moses instructed the chosen people to construct from the branches of trees to protect themselves against the elements were really imaginary, and refer rather to the protection of the Law and the Gospel which those who would serve God must utilize in their journey toward eternity². In like manner the mountain of the Lord does not exist on this planet, but it is rather Christ "Who has taken a body *ex homine* in which He now dwells above every principality and power . . . and upon which mountain [namely, Christ] has been built the city . . . which is His body, the Church, whereunto those men belong who have been elected in His body before the constitution of the world."³

Immediately spelling out the significance of this event in the moral order, Hilary maintains that that man alone will inhabit the Lord's tent "who enters uncontaminated and lives beyond every stain of sin . . . and to whom, after the washing of baptism, no *sordes* or corruption adheres; but immaculate and resplendent, his body is not contaminated by impurities, nor his eyes demeaned by theatrical spectacles, nor his mind beclouded with wine, and whose life is not a slave to money." To do the work demanded

¹ Ibid. 84–85: *talibus praeceptis formatur, talibus monitis instruitur, cui ad deum iter est . . . praeceptum autem omne brevitatem collectum est, ut memoriae mandetur, ut haeret animo, ut foris ac domi, publice privatimque, die ac nocte retineatur, ut temperetur, instetur. est enim haec brevitas locuples et infinita et ex omnibus novi ac veteris Testamenti praeceptis institutisque decerpta, infantibus, feminis, viris, senibus apitissima. atque ut brevitatis ipsius commendabilior esse possit opulentia, quid in singulis verbis sacramenti sit, prosequemur.* Cf. similar sentiments in the introduction to his translation of St. Basil's Homilies of Origen on the Psalms by Rufinus of Aquileia, PG 12, 1319.

² In Ps. 14,3: CSEL 22, 85.

³ Ibid. 4: 86. This reference to the Church as Christ's body pre-existing the world is an allusion to 1 Cor 3: 11 as elucidated by Origen, and so masterfully analyzed by Fr. H. Crouzel in his *Virginité et Mariage selon Origène*, Paris, 1963, 15–44.

by justice, good must not only be contemplated but achieved, benevolence must not merely be initiated but brought to completion, for justice only produces fruit when it is accomplished¹.

Yet even this does not suffice, for the gentiles do these things by avoiding vice, that they may be of good repute. Distinguishing with St. Paul between the animal, the carnal, and the spiritual man, Hilary describes the carnal man as given to the services of the body with its concomitant vices. He credits the animal man with following his good instincts to accomplish what is *decens et honestum* and by distinguishing between the *utilia* and *honestia* in Stoic fashion, he spurns money, controls his appetites, avoids ambition, and thus becomes venerable in his goodness².

But the spiritual man acts in accordance with his knowledge of God, carrying out his Divine Will, pursuing God's secret counsels and the wisdom hidden from the world "which is knowable through revelation and the gift of the Holy Spirit, namely: the significance of God's having become incarnate, his triumph on the cross, and his exercising of power over death through the resurrection"³.

Even here, however, evidently based on his personal experience in the battle over orthodoxy, Hilary has reservations. The truly spiritual man must achieve union with Christ who is absolute truth. "For many", he says, "fatigue their bodies by fasting, give testimony of their constancy by distributing their goods to the poor, and of their chasteness by practicing virginity", but unless their faith is adequate in accepting Christ in the fullness of his divinity, they are deficient.³ Not only must they confess Christ as he is in himself, but they must conform to the requirements of truth in every day life. This, he admits, and he is apparently echoing Tertullian, is most difficult, since daily some type of mendacity seems unavoidable when for example "it is necessary not to betray one who is hiding against a persecutor, or give testimony for one in peril, or conceal the fatal illness from the sick". Hilary would seem to justify such dissimulation covering it with St. Paul's advice that "*doctrinam nostram sale esse conditam*" (Col. 4:6)⁴.

¹ Ibid. 6: 88.

² Ibid. 7: 88–89.

³ Ibid. 8: 90; cf. J. Beumer, *Hilarius von Poitiers, ein Vertreter der christlichen Gnosis*, TQ 132, 1952, 170–192.

⁴ Ibid. 9–10: 90–91; Tertullian speaks of the *incursiones cotidiana*e in *De Pudicitia*, 19, FLP 10,89.

He advises that there is a further step to be taken wherein a man who is innocent at heart, who pursues justice and truth, and does not deceive himself or others, must tend toward perfection. This requires the control, the rejection, and finally the destruction of a tendency common to all mankind, namely pride, with its temptation to domineer over others. Hilary terms this vice "the most inane of human qualities" for it destroys both the possibility of coming to penance oneself, and of truly influencing others¹. He further supplies a brief allusion to what modern moralists term "fraternal correction", suggesting that the proper means of helping others to see the light is not by bitterness and innuendo, but by the *blandimentum* of one's own *emendatio*².

In rounding out his consideration of the moral life, Hilary insists that courage be joined to humility, whereby one can truly enjoy the liberty of the sons of God, facing evil and scandal without flinching, and not being intimidated by respect for persons³.

On the existential plane, he considers the economic situation of his day, using the text supplied by the Psalm – *qui pecuniam suam non dedit ad usuram* – to warn against usury, and along with a strong condemnation of this practice, he forbids the acceptance of emoluments or bribes on the part of judges and other officials, while suggesting that in accepting what is one's own due by way of payment or compensation for goods or services, a certain what we might term *noblesse oblige* is proper, again giving as motivation the perfect practice of charity⁴.

From these observations it will be seen that, as a moralist, Hilary follows the tradition that goes back at least as far as Irenaeus, and grafts onto the Law of Christ those elements in the surrounding culture that justify reference to the moral teaching of the early Christian *paideia*⁵. Throughout his Commentary on the Psalms his primary concern is to edify in the sense of supplying moral and ascetical direction for what he terms the "science of life" exercised under the guidance of Divine Wisdom incarnate in the world in the person of Christ, and extended

¹ In Ps. 14,11: CSEL 22, 91.

² Ibid. 12: 92–93.

³ Ibid. 12: 92–93.

⁴ Ibid. 15–16: 94–95.

⁵ Cf. M. J. Rondeau, *Remarques sur l'anthropologie de saint Hilaire*, Studia Patristica VI (TU 81), Berlin 1962, 197–210.

through the ages in the Church. Functioning as one of the earlier bridges between the practical moralism of the west and the mystical theologizing of the oriental fathers, he manifests a clear and precise approach to the problems of daily life as they must be faced here and now, but *sub specie aeternitatis*. His anthropology is at once biblical and stoic in orientation¹; his awareness of the world almost sociological in its comprehension; and there are many indications of a modification of his thought under the pressure of his personal experiences². But the clearest manifestation of his practical moral sense is in the tract on Psalm 14 which has been all too briefly and inadequately elucidated here.

¹ Cf. G. Wingren, Man and the Incarnation, Eng. transl. by R. Mackenzie, London, Oliver and Boyd, 1959, 14–36, 147–181; F. Murphy, The Background to a History of Patristic Moral Thought, *Studia Moralia I*, Rome, Ancora, 1963, 80–83.

² After having, apparently in his earlier career, accepted the Eusebian thesis of the Emperor's right to play a part in ecclesiastical affairs, Hilary gradually comes to re-evaluate this notion, and in his *Ad Constantium Augustum* he writes: *Idcirco laboratis et salutaribus consiliis rempublicam regetis; excubatis etiam et vigilatis: ut quibus imperatis, dulcissima libertate potiantur . . . [ut] . . . unusquisque nulla servitutis necessitate adstrictus, integrum habeat vivendi arbitrium.* PL 10, 557–558. In the preceding paragraph he had invited the emperor to instruct his judges and provincial administrators that their sole charge was to provide for public affairs, and to refrain from entering into religious issues, and cease threatening and using violence on clerics. It is a subject worthy of further study.

Caritas and the Ascent Motif in the Exegetical Works of St. Ambrose

R. T. OTTEN, Grand Rapids

In recent years interest in St. Ambrose has been renewed, partly in the bishop himself, partly in his more famous catechumen. At any rate, his reputation has been greatly enhanced, for it has been convincingly demonstrated that his philosophic range and depth were considerably greater than had been suspected¹. If not an original or seminal thinker, he stands in the best tradition of *Romanitas* as a man of high intellectual competence and cultivation, profoundly acquainted with the philosophic tradition in which he stood and acutely aware of the spiritual and intellectual currents of his own day. He can no longer be ignored in the intellectual history of the West. Similarly, while his importance in Western spirituality has long been recognized, a study of his place in this tradition has only recently been begun, and much remains to be done. Early Christian mysticism owed much both to the Platonic tradition which antedated it and to the later Neoplatonic system contemporaneous with it. Here Ambrose stands in a unique position, for while it appears unlikely that he himself was a mystic, his own deep personal devotion and piety, combined with his firm intellectual grasp, helped through St. Augustine to influence the forms and vocabulary of the Western spirituality². In this communication

¹ Basic are the well-known studies of P. Courcelle: «Plotin et saint Ambroise», RPh 76, 1950, 29–56; *Recherches sur les Confessions de saint Augustin*, Paris, 1950; «Possidius et les Confessions de saint Augustin», RecSR 39, 1951, 428–442 (*Mélanges Lebreton I*); «Nouveaux aspects du platonisme chez saint Ambroise», REL 34, 1956, 220–239; «La colle et la clou de l'âme dans la tradition néoplatonicienne», RBPh 36, 1958, 73–95; «De Platon à saint Ambroise par Apulée», RPh 35, 1961, 15–28. Cf. P. Hadot, «Platon et Plotin dans trois sermons de saint Ambroise», REL 34, 1956, 202–220; A. Solignac, «Nouveaux parallèles entre saint Ambroise et Plotin», Arch. Philos. 20, 1956, 148–156.

² Cf. C. Mohrmann, *Études sur le latin des chrétiens II*, Roma, 1961, 348; H. Riedlinger, *Die Makellosigkeit der Kirche in den lateinischen Hohliedkommentaren des Mittelalters*, Münster, 1958, pp. 42–47 and *passim*.

I should like briefly to examine one facet of the many-sided problem of Ambrose's place in this tradition, that of the vocabulary and imagery of love in his description of the mystical ascent. *Caritas*, it will be seen, provides both the *impulse to*, and the *means of*, the ascent. This forms the two divisions of the paper.

The impulse to the life of ascent is rooted in the death and resurrection of Christ, into which we are initiated and in which we participate in the sacrament of baptism¹. This sacrificial death of Christ, a movement of descent, is an act of love – *caritas*; it is indeed love itself: "And so our *Caritas* is Christ, when he sacrificed Himself in His death for our sins, a gracious love (*bona caritas*) which has forgiven our sins" (*Isaac* 8.75, Sch. 694.11s.). This passage stands in a context replete with baptismal references². Again: "You have also received the pledge of Christ's love (*pignus Christi caritatis*), in that he . . . died for you . . ."³ This is the pledge of divine love in baptism⁴, for baptism in Christ grants a fuller measure of His *caritas*⁵. Clothed in the costly garment of divine *caritas* the purified soul rises from the earth, from the desert of this life to the paradisical garden of everlasting joy, for in baptism it puts on (*induere*) Christ, who is *caritas*⁶. Baptism not only marks the beginning of the

¹ The theme is common enough in the sacramental theology of the early church not to require extensive documentation. References to Romans 6.3ss. and to Colossians 2.12 may be found in Ambrose *passim*; e. g. Sacr. 2.7.23 (Faller 35.7.22ss.); Fuga 9.55 (Sch. 206.5–7); Paen. 2.2.8 (Faller 167.2.39ss.); Luc. 10.96 (Sch. 492.6). Cf. W. Seibel, *Fleisch und Geist beim heiligen Ambrosius*, München, 1958, p. 162 ss. On the significance of baptism in establishing an inner relationship between Christ and the soul, see K. Baus, "Das Nachwirken des Origenes in der Christusfrömmigkeit des heiligen Ambrosius", RQA 49, 1954, 21–55, esp. 41 s.

² *Nascimur, renascimur, signaculum, confessio, perfectio* (Sch. 693.15–694.12).

³ Jacob 1.6.22 (Sch. 18.16s.). Note the baptismal context: *mortuus es peccato* (18.14); *compatiare, commoriare, consepteliare* (19.1s.).

⁴ Isaac 4.37 (Sch. 664.14s.): *accipit haec anima bona pignora caritatis*. Baptismal refl.: *crux Christi, signaculum, confessio, bonus odor, noctis umbra* (Sch. 664.8–13).

⁵ I. e. than does the baptism of John. Ps. 118.16.19 (Pet. 363.19–20): *ut iste oculus gratiae sit, qui Christi sibi pleniorem adquisiverit caritatem*.

⁶ Ps. 118.14.34 (Pet. 320.21ss.): *anima deo devota . . . pretioso caritatis divinae se vestivit involucro . . . anima candida ascendit e terris quia fulget amicta ueste sapientiae . . . ea, inquam, anima meritis ascendit alentibus ex isto vitae huius, ut habent plerique, deserto ad illum florentem semper locum iucunditatis aeternae*; 8.16 (Pet. 159.25s.): *omnes qui Christum induimus et*

ascent, but is, Ambrose insists, its necessary and indispensable prerequisite: "No one ascends to the kingdom of heaven except through the sacrament of baptism." Further, "No one ascends to the kingdom of heaven except through water and the spirit . . . and you can ascend, should you receive the grace of the sacrament."¹ For baptism, the gift of the descending Caritas, is also a movement of ascent: "In the water of baptism there are both descent and ascent, since he who has gone down (*descenderit*) into the holy font also comes up (*ascendit*), so that he may seek the things which are above; for he who is baptized in Christ both descends into His death and ascends into His resurrection" (*Ps.* 37.10, *Pet.* 143.22s.). This sacramental participation in Christ's resurrection as a movement of ascent is everywhere noted by Ambrose: "Since we have been raised with Christ, let us live in Him, let us ascend in Him" (*Fug.* 8.44, *Sch.* 198.24s.). "Christ is all things for you: a stone, so that you may be built up; a mountain, so that you may ascend; ascend, then, above the mountain, you who seek the things of heaven" (*Interpell.* 4.4.17, *Sch.* 279.19ss.). Thus Christ, who is Caritas Itself, and the One to whom we ascend, is also the mountain by which we ascend. Again: "For the Son of Man, who came from heaven, is also the One who has gone up into heaven . . . He, too, ascends into heaven who, setting aside the things of the earth, is buried with Christ, so that he may rise with Christ."²

With these last two passages we have entered the next phase of the new life begun in baptism. Roused by the divine Caritas, the soul is awakened in baptism to a new way of life, a life of ascent which is, as it were, a direct reflex of the divine Caritas.

baptizati in Christo sumus . . . ; Issac 8.75 (Sch. 694.10ss.): caritas itaque nostra Christus . . . bona caritas . . . et ideo nostra anima induat caritatem . . . The references here to the vesting in the baptismal liturgy are obvious; cf. *Luc.* 5.25 (*Sch.* 190.18s.): *servemus igitur vestem, quam nos sacro dominus emergentes fonte vestivit; Myst.* 7.34 (*Faller* 102.7.1ss.): *Accepisti post haec vestimenta candida, ut esset indicio, quod exueris involucrum peccatorum, indueris innocentiae casta velamina . . . Induere* as a baptismal term can be traced back to *Gal.* 3.27; we meet the idiom already in *Tertullian*: *domino . . . quem in baptismate induerint* (*Res.* 19, *Evans* 52.19.16s.); *Christum induit* (*ibid.* 56, *Evans* 168.56.17); *baptisma eius induerint* (*An.* 50.2, *Waszink* 68.55 and note in loc. p. 520).

¹ *Abr.* 2.11.79 (*Sch.* 632.10s.): *quia nemo ascendit in regnum caelorum nisi per sacramentum baptismatis. Hel.* 22.84 (*Sch.* 464.7s.): *nemo enim nisi per aquam et spiritum ascendit in regnum caelorum.* Cf. *Ps.* 118.16.21 (*Pet.* 364.6).

² *Ps.* 37.3 (*Pet.* 139.4ss.); cf. *Interpell.* 3.7 (*Sch.* 252.26).

The soul finds its desires re-fashioned and re-directed. It assumes a new attitude and posture pursuing that which lies above it – the *caelestia*, *superiora*, and *invisibilia*, rejecting and scorning the *terrena*, *inferiora*, and *carnalia*. The way of ascent is thus also one of moral ascesis, discipline, and purgation¹. The movement is one, but its moments two-fold: it is at once pursuit and flight, approximation and distance, vivification and mortification, union and separation. Now it is precisely in this area that Ambrose is able to accommodate the terminology of the *Platonici*² to the Christian mystical doctrine. The concept of love plays here a key role, for around it are clustered metaphors and figures found in both the Scriptures and the literature of the Platonic philosophic tradition. The Biblical *agape* and the profane *eros*, *caritas* and *amor*, draw within their orbit imagery and symbols whose meaning and interpretation have given new stimulus and direction to the study of the relationship of Christianity to the Classical antecedents³.

I should like to draw attention now to some of the *caritas* imagery employed by Ambrose in his description of the mystical ascent.

The imagery of flight is richly nuanced in Ambrose. Here he had much to draw on – the Scriptures, the Platonic tradition, and earlier Christian authors⁴. In the pervasively Neoplatonic *De*

¹ Ps. 1.18 (Pet. 13.15ss.): *hic enim ordo est disciplinae, ut ab inferioribus ad perfectiora contendas . . . Iacob vir exercitationis, qui nobis propositus est, ut per illum cognosceremus gradum virtutis paulatim nos proferre debere et ita posse ab imis ad summa contendere, si per processus gradiamur exiguo ad ea, quae videntur humanae altiora naturae. has tibi scalas semper habeto propositas. ne timeas, o homo, gradus hos ascendere disciplinae.* That this *exercitatio* is a corollary of ascent and implicit in the descent of the divine Caritas Ambrose expressly states: *bona caritas, quae peccata remisit. et ideo nostra anima induat caritatem, et caritatem huiusmodi, quae sit valida ut mors, quia sicut mors finis peccatorum est, ita et caritas, quoniam qui diligit dominum peccare desinit* (Issac 8.76, Sch. 694.12ss.).

² Cf. the texts and the bibliographies of the studies cited p. 442, n. 1.

³ One thinks immediately of Bishop Nygren's famous *Agape* and *Eros* (Eng. trans., London, 1953). More directly related to patristic studies are W. Völker, *Gregor von Nyssa als Mystiker*, Wiesbaden, 1955; J. Daniélou, *Platonisme et théologie mystique*, Paris, 1954²; and, on the semasiological side, H. Pétré, *Caritas. Étude sur le vocabulaire de la charité chrétienne*, Louvain, 1948.

⁴ Cf. A. d'Alès, «Les ailes de l'âme», EThL 10, 1933, 63–72; P. Courcelle, «Quelques symboles funéraires du néo-platonisme latin», REA 46, 1944, 66–73; idem, «Nouveaux aspects . . .», REL 34, p. 226ss.; F. Sühling, *Die Taube als*

*bono mortis*¹ Ambrose states: "Let us free ourselves from the bond of the body, let us strive for the eternal and fly to the divine with the wings of love and the oarage of love (*pinnis dilectionis et remigio caritatis*) . . ." He goes on to call the soul the *aquila*, "concerning whom it is said, 'Thy youth shall be renewed like the eagle.' This is addressed to the soul. Let our soul, then, like the eagle seek what is lofty, let it fly above the clouds . . ." The reference is to *Psalm 102 (103) 5*, a text to which Ambrose gives a sacramental significance in his sermons to the catechumens and to the neophytes². *Pennae* occurs more frequently in passages based on *Psalm 54 (55) 7 – quis dabit mihi pennas sicut columbae?* – which Ambrose explicitly interprets as an anticipation of baptism in his sermons on Luke³, and develops in another passage in the context of baptism (*Interpell.* 4.1.5–2.6, Sch. 271.11–272.2). An extended commentary on this verse is to be found in the *De fuga saeculi* (5.27–28, Sch. 186.7–187.7), a passage which is filled with the imagery of flight, that flight which, as we have seen, is undertaken in baptism⁴. *Remigium* – derived, it seems, from Ambrose's reading of Vergil⁵ – occurs frequently in the ascent passages⁶. There need be no surprise

religiöses Symbol im christlichen Altertum, Freiburg, 1930; L. Eizenhöfer, «Die Siegelbildvorschläge des Clemens von Alexandrien», JbAC 3, 1960, 51ss.; J. Daniélou, Message évangélique et culture hellénistique, Tournai, 1961, 115ss.; idem, Les symboles chrétiens primitifs, Paris, 1961, 77ss.

¹ Cf. P. Hadot, «Platon et Plotin . . .», REL 34, 210ss.

² Sacr. 4.2.7 (Faller 48.7.23s.); Myst. 8.43 (Faller 107.8.4); cf. Hex. 6.9.74 (Sch. 260.16s.): *et ideo unus quasi de volatilibus est homo, qui alta visu petat et quodam remigio volitet sublimum sagacitatem sensuum.*

³ Luc. 2.92 (Sch. 95.12ss.): *docuit etiam David qui propheticō spiritu cernens baptismatis sacramentum ait: quis dabit mihi pinnas sicut columbae?*

⁴ Most striking is: *Merito habebat* [i. e. David] *facultatem volandi qui pennas resurrectionis acceperat . . .*, the comment on Ps. 138 (139) 2, *sessionem meam et resurrectionem meam*. Cf. also the reference to Ps. 90 (91) 4 in Patr. 5.26 (Sch. 139.16): *qui speret in pinnis domini.*

⁵ Cf. Aen. 1.301 and 6.19, and Lucretius 6.743, *remigi . . . pennarum.*

⁶ Cf. Abr. 2.8.56 (Sch. 609.24ss.): *fides . . . quae columbae more in sublime subrigitur, lustrans superna et spiritualibus alarum remigii caelum circumvolans;* Ps. 118.14.38 (Pet. 323.24ss.): *illas tibi alas dedit, ut tu disceres evolare de terris neque vero cunctandum putes quomodo tibi volandum sit, quibus alarum remigii;* Hex. 6.9.74, *quodam remigio*, cited above n. 2; Ps. 118.14.38 (Pet. 324.13ss.): *spiritale remigium . . . maiora remigia . . . minora* [sc. remigia]; Epist. ad Iren. 29.17 (PL 16.1058C): *ut renovatis alarum remigii alta petere* (cited by Courcelle, REL 34, p. 249, n. 2); Virgt. 18.115: *habet igitur alas anima suas, quibus se possit libera levare de terris. alarum autem remigium non materialis compago pennarum, sed continuus ordo bonorum factorum est.*

that it is *caritas* and not *amor* that is here employed, for Ambrose tends to avoid *amor* to express the virtue of Christian love. *Remigium* appears with *devotio*, *fides*, and *pietas*, virtues with which *caritas* rather than *amor* ranks¹.

References to *alae* are predictably numerous, but again, though it is true that Ambrose's philosophic background here reveals itself (amply documented by Prof. Courcelle), the image is thoroughly domiciled in his mystical thought. A passage in the commentary on *Psalm 118* (14.38–39, Pet. 323.20–325.10) contains many references to flight, an obvious allusion to baptism (*avis es, o homo, qui sicut in quandam aquilae renovatus es iuventutem*), and concludes with the moving prayer, "Grant us, O Lord, Thy help so that we may follow Thee, bound by Thy fetters, for there are no fetters stronger or more lovely than the fetters of Thy love. He who is fettered to Thee is freed from the world." The other references to the *alae* and *caritas* I reluctantly leave aside; they deserve independent treatment along with the imagery of the mystical union.

The figure of the horse and of the chariot are also deeply rooted in both the Scriptures and the philosophic literature of Platonic tradition as symbols of ascent. In only two passages² are they related to *caritas*: ". . . the good horses (i. e. the cardinal virtues) are under the yoke of faith and are held tight by the reins of love (*vinculo caritatis*), the bridle of righteousness, and the halters of moderation." The second passage refers to the affection of the soul as controlled by the *vinculis caritatis, mentis habenis*.

The figure of the nail of the soul (*clavus*) has recently been shown to be a persistent Platonic motif³. But once more Ambrose has pressed a Platonic image into Christian service. He relates this figure of the nail frequently to the nails which pierced the hands and the feet of Christ on the cross and interprets it mystically. It is not at first glance a symbol of ascent, but employed as a symbol of renunciation and of the sacramental mortification with Christ in His death assumed in baptism, it forms an integral

¹ *Remigia devotionis et fidei* (Ps. 118.22.5, Pet. 491.10s.); *pietatis remigio* (Jacob 2.10.44, Sch.61.1).

² The two passages are Issac 8.66 (Sch. 688.20s.) and Virgt. 13.77.

³ Cf. P. Courcelle, "La colle . . .", RBPh 36, 73ss., who examines its usage in such Christian writers as Justin Martyr, Gregory of Nyssa, St. Basil, Arnobius, and Ambrose. Cf. also P. Hadot in REL 34, 213, n. 2, and W. Seibel, op. cit. p. 119s.

part of the life and discipline of ascent: *Mortuus est tibi princeps sacerdotum, tibi crucifixus est, ut clavis eius adhaereas* (*Fug.* 9.57, Sch. 206.16–207.7). This is followed by many baptismal references: *chirographa* (206.18), *renuntiasti* (19), *vetus homo . . . nova creatura* (207.4), *mortis similitudini conseputi* (5), *alas gratiae spiritalis* (6), and *volate* (7)¹. This interpretation of *clavus* is further developed in *Ps.* 118.15.39 (Pet. 350.27–351.24). Here the catechumens are exhorted to be fastened with the nails of Christ (i. e. the nail of fear, *timor*, and the nail of love, *caritas*), especially the nail of love, for the sharpness of the nails is only the sharpness of Christ's love (*duritia caritatis*). Then he continues: "With these nails of love let our body and our soul be fastened . . .; *caritas* has its own nail, its own sword with which the soul is wounded. Blessed is he who is deemed worthy to be wounded by this sword." Thus the *clavus* which in the previous passage is a symbol of mortification, of participation with Christ in His death, and hence of ascent, becomes in this passage, along with *vulnus* and *gladius*, an image of vivification, that is, participation in Christ's life, and hence mystical union².

Here we may conclude, for *caritas* in the life of mystical union has its own vocabulary and imagery. To sum up. The divine *caritas* which descends in baptism re-ascends in the life of the baptized, for baptism marks the first step on the way of ascent. It is the same *caritas* which descends and ascends. The donor of life becomes the *donum* of life; the act of love in grace activates the life of grace³. He who is the life is also the way, for "He became the way for mortals only that they might ascend; He first descended only that His saints might be deemed worthy to ascend" (*Ps.* 43.40, Sch. 291.5ss.). *Cum Christo resurreximus, in ipso vivamus, in ipso ascendamus*. So far Ambrose is carefully scriptural in his idiom. But in his account and analysis of the mystical ascent he draws with confidence and discrimination upon the treasury of Neoplatonism, blending it skillfully and masterfully with the fund of the Scriptures.

¹ Cf. *Sacr.* 2.7.23 (Faller 35.7.28ss.); *Iacob* 5.17 (Sch. 16.11ss.).

² This is true also for the passage *Luc.* 5.27 (Sch. 192.1s.); *ligatus sum fide clavis quibusdam et bonis compedibus caritatis innexus sum* etc. *Claviculus caritatis* appears in *Hex.* 3.12.52 (Sch. 94.4s.).

³ I may refer here to H.-C. Puech and P. Hadot, «L'entretien d'Origène avec Héraclide», (*VC* 13 [1959] 204–234): «La vie de l'âme, pour Origène, et pour Ambroise, dans la mesure où il suit Origène, est étrangère à l'âme; elle est un don du Christ, elle est le Christ lui-même faisant vivre l'âme.»

L'aumône chez Grégoire de Nysse et Grégoire de Nazianze

FRANCE QUÉRÉ-JAULMES, Cachan

Introduction

La notion d'aumône dans l'Eglise primitive a prêté à plus d'un malentendu. On a reproché aux Pères de n'avoir pensé qu'à elle comme remède à l'inégalité sociale qui régnait au 4^e siècle, au lieu de jeter les bases d'une économie nouvelle. Car l'aumône, outre qu'elle constitue en soi un moyen modeste de lutte, est encore une notion équivoque qui peut masquer l'intention conservatrice de celui qui la professe; l'aumône en effet, semble la justification du riche, devant les hommes et devant Dieu; devant les hommes, parce qu'elle rend tolérable le scandale, devant Dieu, parce qu'elle devient la monnaie du salut personnel.

1. Caractères communs

L'aumône est une exigence de la justice

Ces ambiguïtés n'existent en fait que pour une époque qui a dénaturé le sens que les premiers siècles donnaient à l'aumône, en la réduisant à une simple et minime faveur du riche envers le pauvre. Dans la pensée des Pères, l'aumône est en réalité une exigence de la justice, et représente un véritable droit du pauvre; car tous les biens n'appartiennent qu'à Dieu, et Dieu les a donnés en commun à tous les hommes. L'histoire de l'homme (Adam), le spectacle de la nature témoignent clairement de l'esprit d'égalité qui a présidé à la création; Grégoire de Nazianze parle de cette *loi sublime et première d'un Dieu qui laisse tomber sa pluie sur les justes et sur les injustes et fait lever son soleil sur tous les hommes sans distinction. Ses dons ne tombent pas aux mains des forts, ni ne sont mesurés par une loi, ni partagés entre des états. Tout est commun, tout est en abondance*¹.

¹ PG 35, serm. 14,25.

Condamnation de la richesse

Toute richesse, réservée à l'usage exclusif de son possesseur, constitue donc un vol manifeste. Notons ici l'originalité des deux cappadociens, qui poussent l'accusation beaucoup plus loin que les autres Pères grecs. Clément d'Alexandrie ou Basile admettaient que les richesses pouvaient être justement acquises; pour nos deux Pères, la richesse est le signe irréfutable du péché: *pauvreté et richesse arrivèrent tard chez les hommes, et déferlèrent comme une épidémie, amenées par le péché dont elles étaient les œuvres*¹. Plus précisément, la pauvreté est le résultat de l'oppression du fort sur le faible: *l'envie, la tyrannie rusée du serpent ont dressé le fort contre le faible*². Et si au cours des temps, la richesse a pris l'apparence d'un droit, c'est que la légalité dont elle se réclame a été inspirée, non par la justice, mais par l'intérêt des nantis: *l'avarice, pour se soutenir, s'est appuyée sur l'autorité des lois*, note Grégoire de Nazianze³.

L'aumône est une obéissance à Dieu

Les riches ont donc ruiné l'économie de Dieu. L'aumône, pour les deux Pères, a pour mission de réintroduire la politique de Dieu parmi les hommes. Elle s'élargit aux dimensions mêmes de la foi qui l'anime.

Mais si les Pères ont prêché l'aumône au nom des mêmes exigences, le sens que chacun d'eux lui donne fait diverger leurs pensées. Pour Grégoire de Nysse, l'aumône est un partage où l'unité première se rescelle; pour Grégoire de Nazianze, elle arrache l'homme à son angoisse essentielle et le rend à son unique vérité, Jésus-Christ.

2. Grégoire de Nysse

La doctrine de l'ordre du monde

La pensée de Grégoire de Nysse, pétrie de culture grecque, est dominée par le sens de l'ordre du monde, du «cosmos». Sa réflexion dans les deux homélies qu'il a composées sur la pauvreté,

¹ PG 35, serm. 14,25.

² PG 35, serm. 14,26.

³ PG 35, serm. 14,26.

se tend constamment vers l'évocation du règne de Dieu, qui est un ordre eschatologique: à la fin des temps, Dieu viendra réarranger sa création troublée en triant les bons d'entre les injustes. Grégoire rappelle d'autre part l'ordre originel du monde, dont la nature offre encore quelques témoignages, ainsi que le mandat initial de l'homme, créé pour gouverner le monde, dans la raison et l'équité.

Le partage des fortunes

Sa conception de l'aumône s'insère dans cet effort vers le rétablissement de l'ordre divin. *Nivellez vos différences*, dit-il dans la première homélie¹. Cette expression est significative: il s'agit véritablement d'égaliser les biens, afin que tous les hommes se retrouvent au même niveau économique. Ce souci explique chez lui la collusion des prédications sur le jeûne et sur la charité. Par le jeûne, l'homme s'abaisse au niveau de ses frères défavorisés; en même temps, en donnant au pauvre ce qu'il s'est refusé, il le hisse et le ramène jusqu'à lui-même; ainsi l'équilibre s'établit-il des deux côtés à la fois: le pauvre s'enrichit des pauvretés du riche, tandis que le riche s'appauvrit des richesses du pauvre. C'est encore dans cette pensée que Grégoire de Nysse insiste sur la nécessité absolue du don matériel, si tenu soit-il: *êtes-vous pauvre? N'offrez que ce que vous possédez: l'un du pain, l'autre une coupe de vin, un troisième un manteau et vous aurez ainsi contribué au bonheur d'un homme*².

Unité du monde

Mais cette exigence d'un strict partage poursuit un dessein plus ambitieux: c'est de réunir toute la création dont le péché avait cassé l'unité. Dans les deux homélies, Grégoire ne cesse de rappeler à l'homme sa communauté de destin et de nature avec tous les hommes. Le mal fondamental n'est pas tant la soif de jouissance ou de possession qui étreint le riche, que son refus d'intégrer ses frères dans sa société et sa volonté d'ériger avec la richesse, des barrières factices. L'aumône devient mouvement d'approche, reconnaissance de fraternité (ce mot de frère réapparaît sans cesse dans les deux homélies): *mais n'allez pas me*

¹ PG 46,460.

² PG 46,460.

répondre que vous feriez assez pour eux si vous leur apportiez à manger en un lieu éloigné de nos villes, où vous les auriez préalablement conduits. Cette solution manque par trop d'amour, qui, sous un air de bonté, consiste à éliminer ces hommes de notre société. Quoi! Nous ne rougissons pas d'abriter sous notre toit des porcs et des chiens, et notre frère, notre semblable, nous le ravalerais plus bas que les animaux? Non, mes frères, non! Ne laissez pas triompher cette décision inhumaine! Rappelez-vous qui ils sont: des hommes, oui, pareils à nous, que rien ne distingue de la commune nature¹. Et ailleurs: Que devons-nous faire? Ne pas déchirer l'unité que l'Esprit a mise dans le monde, c'est-à-dire ne pas tenir pour étrangers des êtres qui partagent notre nature².

L'aumône, dans ce système de pensée, cesse d'être une simple affaire de conscience individuelle; elle implique tout le destin de la chose créée. Exigence de justice, exigence d'unité, elle participe à la reconstruction du monde, elle prend l'envergure même du Royaume en marche.

3. Grégoire de Nazianze

Misère de la condition humaine

Chez Grégoire de Nazianze, le sens donné à l'aumône n'a peut-être pas cette ampleur. Mais il a une autre dimension. L'aumône met l'être aux prises non plus avec un monde à bâtir, mais avec sa propre condition. Car le pauvre n'est que l'image la plus saisissante de l'homme, et du riche en particulier, il est loin de former une humanité séparée. Existente en lui les mêmes détresses qui sont comme la trame de la nature humaine. Le pauvre est en effet, comme chacun de nous, le jouet de la vanité du monde. Son corps, rongé par la maladie, témoigne des trahisons perpétuelles de notre chair, qui n'est, dit Grégoire, que honte, douleur, mensonge³. Sa misère matérielle est la preuve de l'inconstance des fortunes qui arrivent, repartent, enlevées par un destin aveugle qui n'est peut-être que le hasard: *nos biens ici sont fugaces et passagers et, comme au jeu de dés, ils passent de mains en mains, et il n'est rien que nous possédions réellement. Le temps finit par nous le prendre si la jalouse nous avait épargnés*⁴.

¹ PG 46,480.

² PG 46,473.

³ PG 35, serm. 14,6.

⁴ PG 35, serm. 14,20.

Le pauvre est donc la vérité du riche. L'aumône, chez Grégoire de Nazianze, est inspirée par la conscience de la misère de la chair et en son frère déshérité, c'est l'universelle détresse que secourt le riche: *ma faiblesse se révèle dans les maux d'autrui... N'allons pas négliger ceux qui sont tombés les premiers dans une déchéance qui nous guette tous. Au lieu de nous réjouir de notre bonne santé, affligeons-nous plutôt des infirmités de nos frères*¹.

L'aumône est compassion

Il y a là plus qu'un effort vers la justice: l'aumône est le geste de la pitié. On sait qu'un même mot en grec désigne l'aumône et la miséricorde, le geste matériel et la tendresse qui l'inspire. Ce dernier ressort modifie la nature de l'aumône: plus qu'un don matériel il exige le don subtil de l'amour; l'homme se compromet dans son offrande et en donnant, se donne. Il est caractéristique que Grégoire insiste sur cette adhésion de tout l'être à la souffrance d'autrui, bien plus que sur l'efficacité matérielle de l'offrande. On mesure ici toute la distance qui le sépare de Grégoire de Nysse; celui-ci se défiait des «bonnes paroles» et exigeait un secours concret; ici, tout tient dans l'élan du cœur: *que votre empressement supplée à l'insignifiance de votre bienfait. Et si vous ne possédez rien, offrez-lui vos larmes*². Ailleurs: *il faut nous ouvrir de tout notre être à tous les malheureux, quel que soit le nom de leur souffrance*³.

Les signes du salut

Mais la notion d'aumône porte encore un autre sens: la foi en Jésus-Christ. Car ni le monde ni l'homme ne sont seulement objets de pitié; l'un comme l'autre portent les signes cachés de leur Créateur. Le monde, dit Grégoire, est une «énigme» que l'initié peut déchiffrer: *si les choses ici-bas procèdent de lois différentes, la pensée de Dieu se cache néanmoins sous l'apparente bizarrie du monde*⁴. Le corps, «honte et mensonge», garde la dignité d'une œuvre de Dieu: *j'ai eu beau accuser mon corps d'être mon ennemi pour les*

¹ PG 35, serm. 14,8.

² PG 35, serm. 14,28.

³ PG 35, serm. 14,6.

⁴ PG 35, serm. 14,31.

désordres qu'il jette en mon âme, je le chéris néanmoins par respect pour celui qui l'a façonné¹. Dans le pauvre enfin, apparaît le Seigneur: *ils sont comme nous image de Dieu, et peut-être l'altèrent-ils moins que nous, cette image²!*

Dès lors que le monde atteste la fidélité de Dieu, il ne reste plus à l'homme qu'à suivre le modèle, si net en la personne du pauvre. Repousser le pauvre, ce sera repousser le Christ: *ils seront châtiés, pour avoir négligé Jésus-Christ en la personne des pauvres³.* Et encore: *Prêtez assistance au Christ, secourez le Christ, nourrissez le Christ, revêtez le Christ, accueillez le Christ, honorez le Christ⁴.*

L'aumône, imitation de Dieu, sauve les hommes

Cette adhésion à Jésus-Christ dans l'aumône est fondamentale. La prédication sociale recoupe ici une des idées-clés de Grégoire de Nazianze, pour qui la vocation humaine par excellence se fonde sur l'imitation, la *μίμησις* de Jésus-Christ. Toute la vérité de l'homme, mais aussi toute sa grâce résident dans une tension active de l'être vers l'imitation de Jésus-Christ. L'aumône, dans ce contexte, achemine l'homme à la connaissance de Dieu et devient une étape décisive de son initiation chrétienne.

L'aumône, en effet, poursuit la connaissance de Dieu, sur deux lignes: d'une part, l'homme rompt avec des engagements mondains, donc trompeurs; donner, c'est abandonner, au profit des valeurs supérieures: *oui, il nous faut renoncer à tout pour suivre en vérité le Christ, charger sa croix sur nos épaules et nous envoler légèrement, libres et affranchis de tout lien⁵.* D'autre part, grâce à l'amour, l'homme se hisse à la ressemblance de Dieu, entre dans son intime nature, puisque Dieu est par essence *φιλανθρωπία* et *ἀγάπη*: quelle vertu, mieux que la charité, saurait réaliser la vocation de l'homme? *Rien ne fait plus honneur à Dieu que la miséricorde, car rien ne lui ressemble plus⁶;* et encore: *devenez des dieux pour les pauvres en imitant la miséricorde de Dieu⁷.*

¹ PG 35, serm. 14,8.

² PG 35, serm. 14,14.

³ PH 35, serm. 14,39.

⁴ PG 35, serm. 14,40.

⁵ PG 35, serm. 14,18.

⁶ PG 35, serm. 14,5.

⁷ PG 35, serm. 14,26.

Nous retiendrons chez Grégoire de Nazianze la double dé-marche de l'aumône: elle est prise de conscience de l'humaine détresse, elle est aussi la manifestation d'un sentiment profond d'amour et permet l'ascension de l'homme vers la plénitude de Dieu.

Conclusion

Quelles que soient les incertitudes qui marquent la doctrine sociale des Pères, on ne peut que s'étonner de la virulence de leur prédication: l'aumône prend pour tous deux une dimension universelle et créatrice. Dieu a fait les hommes; les hommes ont fait les riches et les pauvres. L'aumône est la force qui s'oppose à l'histoire et confond riches et pauvres, afin qu'il ne reste plus que des hommes. En un temps qui ne pouvait encore penser en termes d'économie politique, il est remarquable que deux théologiens aient trouvé, par des voies purement mystiques, la lucidité et la force qui, si on les eût écoutés, les acheminaient à une révolution sans violence.

The Idea of the Soul as Virgin and Mother in Maximus the Confessor

A. K. SQUIRE O. P., Oxford

Ten years ago, when St Maximus was still, perhaps, rather less talked of than he is today, Père Dalmais published a study of the brief commentary on the *Pater Noster*, which I hope I may regard as absolving me from the need to dwell on the larger context of the passage on which I wish to comment in this communication¹. The more immediate context, the exposition of the petition *Thy kingdom come*², is a very close and concentrated piece of theological reasoning even for Maximus and will, I think, require our closer attention. For the idea to which the passage leads up, that Christ makes the faithful and purified soul both virgin and mother³ is, it seems to me, a natural dénouement to what immediately precedes it. Although this notion is, so far as I am aware, nowhere more aptly and succinctly alluded to by Maximus, it is central to his thought and always latent in his conception of deification, so that it is not altogether relevant to decide whether the work should be dated as early as 628–630 with Polycarp Sherwood⁴ or whether any case could be made out for placing it rather later, as Père Dalmais once very tentatively suggested⁵. The notion has, moreover, a wider interest as illustrating Maximus' capacity to go straight to the theological root of the tradition he inherits. He has, as it were, assimilated something much more significant than the written sources among the Fathers to which one might point as being relevant to his theme, and has emphasized the apostolic conviction that there is, or

¹ I. H. Dalmais, Un traité de théologie contemplative: Le commentaire du Pater de S. Maxime le Confesseur, *Revue d'ascétique et de mystique*, 114, April-June, 1953, pp. 123–159.

² PG 90, 885 B ff.

³ 889 C.

⁴ P. Sherwood, An annotated date-list of the works of Maximus the Confessor, Rome 1952, no. 25, p. 31.

⁵ Op. cit., p. 126.

ought to be, about every Christian soul at least one respect in which it is virginal, namely in its relationship to Christ, and that this relationship is essentially orientated towards spiritual fruitfulness. St John Chrysostom, in a passage to which I shall presently refer, correctly points out that when St Paul speaks of espousing the Corinthians as a chaste virgin to Christ, he is addressing himself not merely to those whom he expects to be virgins in a physical manner, but rather to all who have that spiritual integrity of which physical virginity is only the sign and the shadow. It is equally true that what Maximus has to say on these matters has implications that go beyond the monastic context in which his thought habitually moves.

In so devoted a disciple there is no need to doubt that it is from Gregory of Nyssa's commentary on the Lord's prayer that Maximus derives his idea that the Holy Spirit is the kingdom for whose coming we pray¹. But this interpretation gives him no more than his starting-point, for when he explains that it is by the Spirit that the meek are built up into the temple of God, he introduces a development which would seem to be entirely personal in form². By a series of scriptural texts he argues that the earth, whose inheritance is promised to the meek, cannot be the visible earth, but must rather be that kingdom prepared from the foundation of the world, into whose joy God's faithful servants enter. This they begin to do when they set their feet on the firm and liberating ground of the virtues, for 'set between good report and evil, the humble man remains ἀπαθής, neither puffed up by praise nor depressed by slander'³. Then his soul begins to know that freedom which belongs to its true nature and to experience that rest which the Lord, who is meek and humble of heart, promises to those who take his yoke upon them, being released from slavery to desires and cares. This long passage on meekness and humility, unusual enough in the great doctor of charity to be noteworthy, suggests an underlying con-

¹ De Oratione Dominica, Oratio III (PG 44, 1157 C). At the same time there would also appear to be a Coptic tradition that Evagrius too adopted this interpretation in a commentary on the Pater (cf. I. Hausherr, Les leçons d'un contemplatif, Paris 1960, pp. 83–84).

² While the doctrine is essentially the same, there is no obvious literary dependence on Gregory of Nyssa, De Beatitudinibus, Oratio II, PG 44, 1208 ff.,

³ PG 90, 888 A.

nection with the doctrine of the incarnation which gives the unfolding of the thought a unity not at first apparent. In the preface to his exposition Maximus has explicitly pointed to the parallel between that voluntary kenosis of the Word of God in becoming truly man and that kenosis of the passions by which we may, under grace, become divinized¹. Our own self-emptying is the proper response to the divine self-emptying, for the effects of which we ask in this prayer².

Seeing, then, what is offered to the meek and humble, who, asks Maximus, continuing his argument, will not long for that mark of the kingdom of Christ by which he is, like his royal master, beyond male and female, free from the tyranny of anger and lust³? This reference to the text of St Paul's Epistle to the Galatians 3,28 makes an open enough link with the familiar doctrine of Gregory of Nyssa, for whom the return to the condition of paradise necessarily involves a transcendence of sexuality, since, as St. Paul says, 'in Christ there is neither male nor female'⁴. This interpretation is in no sense to be narrowly conceived. For Gregory, as for Maximus, the mark of the heavenly world is separation from the unruly life of the passions. As he says in the *De virginitate*, the great mysterion shown by the manner of the incarnation is that 'purity is the only adequate sign of the presence and the coming of God, which cannot otherwise be truly attained, unless one separates oneself completely from the passions of the flesh'⁵. This, it will be seen, is, in one sense, to define the essence of virginity and it goes deeper than any merely physical considerations.

Maximus, in the passage we are considering, finds his own image for this separation in the mantle of the prophet Elias which, he says, means 'the mortification of the flesh, wherein the glory of moral beauty consists'⁶. After Père Hausherr's study of self-love in Maximus, I do not need to insist upon the importance for Maximus of one's attitude to one's own body as a gage of one's emancipation from the passions⁷. This mantle of morti-

¹ 877 A.

² 876 B.

³ 888 C.

⁴ Cf. J. Daniélou, *Platonisme et théologie mystique. Essai sur la philosophie religieuse de Saint Grégoire de Nysse*, Paris 1954, pp. 51–53.

⁵ *De Virginitate*, cap. II (PG 46, 324 A).

⁶ PG 90, 889 A.

⁷ I. Hausherr, *Philautie (Orientalia Christiana Analecta 137, Rome 1952)*.

fication is the prophet's parting gift to his disciple and successor Eliseus, and it is to be the means whereby he may divide and cross the turbulent waters which separate him from the holy land.

The elder prophet himself, now liberated and free, goes straight up to God, borne on the fiery horses of the concerted virtues. For he realized, says Maximus, continuing to the incandescent heart of his magnificent image in a sentence which for its length and complexity I shall not attempt to translate¹, he realized that the varying impulses of desire and anger must fall away from the disciple of Christ and that, living and moving and having his being in him, he must not bear in himself that opposition of states which Maximus, with Gregory, sees as implied in the male and female of which St Paul speaks. It is, in a word, necessary to leave behind that condition of mutability in which the *γνώμη* may still be deflected from its true and ultimate good. Maximus elsewhere distinguishes between the *θέλημα φυσικόν*, which is that appetite for things which follows nature, and gnomic will which, he says, is "the voluntary impulse and movement of reason towards one thing or another"². Hence it is the impulses of gnomic will that are vital and determining at a personal level. The freedom of this will is inalienable, but the perfection of its freedom is a permanent orientation towards the true good, which only grace can bring about³. It is the transformation of this will into the divine likeness — for God is necessarily fixed in his own good — which the Holy Spirit effects when he makes it his radiant dwelling-place⁴. So indeed God's kingdom comes as the soul shares in the divine nature *κατὰ τὸ δύνατον*. Without losing its own nature it becomes, in its measure, godlike by a new kind of birth, whereby Christ is always mystically born as he makes it both virgin and mother, transcending male and female cooperation and the existence of things that come to be and pass away.

Thus does Maximus in his conclusion lead us to the positive aspect of virginity on which Gregory of Nyssa had likewise insisted when he said: 'What happened in the stainless Mary in a

¹ PG 90, 889 BC.

² PG 91, 153 AB.

³ For a discussion of these notions see P. Sherwood, *The earlier Ambigua of St. Maximus the Confessor*, Rome 1955, pp. 201–204.

⁴ PG 90, 889 C.

bodily fashion when the fullness of the Godhead that was in Christ shone through her virginity, happens in every soul that is virginal. We know Christ no longer according to the flesh, but spiritually he dwells in us and brings his Father with him, as the Gospel says¹. In the context Gregory is speaking specifically of virginity as an ascetic ideal, like that writer, probably Athanasius, of an older treatise on virginity preserved in Syriac and Armenian, who says to the virgins: I call the Theotokos your Mother². But this sense of an affinity between the dedicated soul and the virgin Mother of God goes back, of course, much further. Origen, in a passage from his second homily on the Canticle, where the context is not specifically monastic, speaking of the words of the angel of the Annunciation, *The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee*, says: 'The birth of Christ began with this shadow; not only in Mary did his birth begin with this shadow, but in you too, if you are worthy, the word of God is born'³. Maximus uses a rather more developed form of the same notion at the beginning of his epistle 19⁴. But perhaps nowhere in his writings are all the elements of a mystical doctrine so closely bound up with the dogma of the Incarnation brought together more concisely than in the passage from the commentary on the Lord's Prayer we have been examining. Thought and imagery hold admirably together, and it is surely legitimate to say that the very terms in which the kenosis of the passions is described, without being limited to any specific ascetic practice, would make it possible to say with St John Chrysostom in his homily 28 on the Epistle to the Hebrews: 'This belongs to all who are virgins in soul, who are free from worldly preoccupations; for these thoughts corrupt souls.' St Paul, Chrysostom insists, is speaking of the universal Church when he says: *For I have espoused you to one husband that I may present you a chaste virgin to Christ.* 'For the incorrupt soul is a virgin, though she have a husband'⁵. John Chrysostom appears here to be merely isolating what is the essential element in one aspect of the tradition. Its completeness,

¹ De Virginitate, cap. II (PG 46, 324 B).

² Syriac text and French trans., J. Lebon, Analecta Syriaca I, Muséon 40, 1927.

³ PG 13, 52 D.

⁴ PG 91, 592 AB.

⁵ PG 63, 201–202.

however, is only adequately expressed when, as in Maximus, the Theotokos is seen as the type of the perfection of every Christian soul. If St John Damascene could say that 'in the name of the Theotokos the whole mystery of the incarnation is implied'¹ it is hardly too much to say that in that name is also implied the mystical life which the incarnation made possible. Maximus himself will say that the incarnation brings it about that 'by a happy correspondence God becomes man by the deification of man and man becomes God by the inhumanizing of God. For always and in everything the Word of God and God wishes to work out the mystery of his infleshing'².

¹ *De Fide Orthodoxa*, lib III, cap. 12 (PG 94, 1029 C).

² PG 91, 1084 CD.

La doctrine des trois voies dans la *Théologie Mystique* du Pseudo-Denys l'Aréopagite

J. VANNESTE S. J., Louvain

Dans la tradition spirituelle, aussi bien en Orient que dans l'Occident, la doctrine des trois voies occupe une place importante. Il est vrai que plus d'une tentative a été faite en vue de fixer les lois de la croissance spirituelle: toujours est-il que les trois voies ou trois stades de la vie spirituelle, purification, illumination et perfection, semblent l'emporter de loin sur d'autres classifications.

L'étude des origines de cette doctrine n'est plus à faire¹. Evagre le Pontique et le Pseudo-Denys en Orient, St. Augustin en Occident sont tributaires d'un enseignement qui remonte à Clément d'Alexandrie et à Origène. Au départ il y a la grande distinction platonicienne entre la *πρακτική* et la *γνῶσις* ou *θεωρία*; dans la suite, une nouvelle division s'opère dans cette dernière réalité: une connaissance et contemplation des êtres créés ou *ψυστική θεωρία*, et une *θεολογία*, connaissance supérieure, une contemplation de Dieu ou gnose de la Sainte Trinité.

Chez Evagre le Pontique, il est aisé de démontrer la provenance: Origène et le monachisme, ce dernier assumant des éléments stoiciens. Le cas n'est pas si simple chez Denys l'Aréopagite: là, les cadres d'une pensée néoplatonicienne se mêlent à des données spécifiquement chrétiens. Du dualisme original platonicien entre la *πρακτική* et la *γνῶσις*, une autre tradition s'est développée. Construite elle aussi en forme ternaire, cette division reçoit de Plotin une profonde orientation religieuse et aboutit, en passant par Jamblique, à Proclus: là, elle prend corps dans un système de pensée très rigoureux. Le partage exact entre les deux influences est toujours à faire: en tout cas, le Pseudo-Denys est tributaire des deux.

¹ Cf. K. Rahner, Über das Problem des Stufenweges zur christlichen Vollendung. Schriften zur Theologie, III, Einsiedeln 1956, pp. 11–34.

Toutefois, il importe, avant de poser le problème qui nous occupe, de préciser: chez le Pseudo-Denys, il n'est pas question de trois voies mais de trois activités. L'activité de la κάθαρσις, l'activité de la φύτισμα, et l'activité de la τελείωσις ou ἔνωσις, celles-ci ayant à leur tour un aspect actif et passif. Cette triple division est typiquement l'apanage de la structure hiérarchique, aussi bien des anges que de l'Eglise. En toute rigueur, cette doctrine des trois stades y est présentée à côté des multiples divisions ternaires qui se recoupent à l'infini.

On ne saurait passer sous silence cette extrême rigueur d'application: la vision dionysienne de l'Eglise est une structure pyramidale en degrés hiérarchiques, où une activité ou une passivité déterminée est liée à chaque degré. «L'ordre de la hiérarchie, c'est que les uns soient purifiés et que les autres purifient; que les uns soient illuminés et que les autres illuminent; que les uns reçoivent la perfection et que les autres la donnent»¹. Pendant l'exposé de Denys, nous nous sentons plus d'une fois gênés par cette extrême rigueur, où sa conception de l'univers, si fortement imprégnée de néoplatonisme, l'a pu mener.

Mais le problème n'est pas là: a-t-on suffisamment remarqué que cette division ternaire en purification, illumination et perfection fait défaut dans le traité de la *Théologie Mystique*? Cette doctrine n'y apparaît pas, ni dans le petit traité, ni dans les paragraphes du traité des *Noms divins*, où l'auteur amorce sa doctrine de l'ascension mystique. Une lecture attentive ne permet pas de trouver, dans la *Théologie Mystique*, la référence explicite de ce remarquable agencement en trois activités.

Certes, il serait aisé, pour la commodité d'un exposé, d'introduire cette division ternaire. Mais le danger n'est pas imaginaire de déformer alors la doctrine dionysienne en la faisant sortir de ses cadres spécifiques, ceci étant d'autant plus facile que le texte de ce traité est dense et énigmatique à souhait.

Sans prendre position à l'égard d'un éventuel partage entre l'influence chrétienne des Pères et celle de la philosophie de Proclus, nous voudrions ici: analyser la démarche mystique dionysienne en ses moments successifs, et comparer le résultat de cette recherche à la doctrine dionysienne des trois activités. Nous constatons que la démarche mystique, telle qu'elle est

¹ De caelesti hierarchia, chap. III, 2, 165 B/C. trad. R. Roques.

décrise dans le petit traité, présente indéniablement une forme spécifique sous les généralités du schéma ternaire.

Remarquons tout d'abord, qu'en parcourant le texte de la *Théologie Mystique*, nous ne trouvons pas la fameuse division ternaire, mais bien une distinction en deux voies. Une κάθοδος ou voie descendante, et une montée ou ἄνοδος. Située au niveau de la connaissance, cette division n'est pas sans rapport avec le double mouvement d'émanation et de retour des êtres, mais elle n'en est pas la simple projection dans le domaine de la connaissance de Dieu. Toujours est-il qu'autour de cette dualité de connaissances de Dieu, l'une par affirmations (ou théologie cataphatique), l'autre par négations (ou théologie apophatique), se profile la trame de la théologie mystique. A l'intérieur de la montée par les négations (*ἄνοδος διὰ τῶν ἀποφάσεων*)¹ joue une nouvelle structure en trois moments.

Analysons maintenant la première des trois activités, la purification. Héritière de la κάθαρσις platonicienne, celle-ci nous est présentée dans le premier chapitre de la *Théologie Mystique*, à l'aide du récit de l'ascension du Sinaï par Moïse. Denys se sert visiblement du récit de l'Exode et distingue nettement: une purification, un dépassement des sommets avec l'abandon des lumières et des paroles divines, et enfin une entrée dans la Ténèbre où se trouve Dieu. «Car ce n'est pas sans raison que le divin Moïse reçoit l'ordre de se purifier d'abord soi-même, et ensuite, de se séparer de ceux qui ne sont pas purs eux-mêmes»².

Cette typologie n'est toutefois pas à l'avant-plan. Denys n'explique guère *ici* en quoi consiste cette ἀποκάθαρσις. Car l'exégèse qui est donnée, qui précède et qui suit cette allusion biblique, est l'exposé bien plus ferme d'une doctrine précise. Il s'agit ni plus ni moins d'un abandon (*ἀπόλειπε*), d'un renoncement. Mais ce renoncement que Denys veut total, πάντα ἀφείνει³, se voit désigner un domaine très restreint: celui d'une connaissance de Dieu par affirmations, soit en partant des réalités intelligibles, soit en partant du monde sensible. En même temps, l'auteur ne cache pas sa préférence pour une connaissance qui procède par négations: au fur et à mesure que son exposé s'avance, il met en évidence ce qu'il appelle — avec toute une

¹ De divinis nominibus, Chap. 13, 3, 981 B.

² De mystica theologia, Chap. 1, 3, 1000 C.

³ Id. Chap. 1, 1 1000 A.

école philosophique¹ — ἀφαλγεσίς: une progression de propositions négatives, s'étendant à tous les êtres, et qui a comme Sujet la Cause transcendante.

En ce premier moment, le Pseudo-Denys ne prend pas appui sur une expérience personnelle de connaissance mystique, comme par exemple le fera plus tard, pour ses nuits, un Jean de la Croix. A l'analyse, l'exemple de Moïse semble n'avoir servi qu'à introduire cette série bien ordonnée de négations, sa théologie négative: l'exigence de renoncement vise à écarter une connaissance de Dieu qui procède par affirmations. Dans le traité de la théologie mystique, il ne semble pas être question d'un niveau moral où s'opéreraient une purification par le renoncement au monde et au mal. Tout se pose ici sur le plan de la connaissance, dans une confrontation de deux types de connaissance. Renonçant à la connaissance par affirmations, le Pseudo-Denys avance l'ἀφαλγεσίς ou la montée par négations: sa seule apologie consiste dans la grande thèse de la transcendance absolue de Dieu: «on n'arrive pas à Le comprendre ni à Le dire ni à Le nommer»².

Le second stade ou la seconde activité est désigné par le vocable φότισμα, quelques fois par ἔλλαμψις, illumination. A première vue, il serait tout à fait indiqué d'examiner l'expérience de Moïse sur le Sinaï, afin de découvrir cette réalité à la suite de l'ἀφαλγεσίς. Le résultat est plutôt décevant, car il y est question d'abandonner les lumières divines, «pour entrer dans la Ténèbre où se trouve vraiment selon la Parole des Ecritures, Celui qui est au delà de tout»³.

Suivons une autre ligne de pensée: il est vrai que cette divine Ténèbre est appelée par deux fois: toute lumineuse, ὑπέρφωτον. Plus significatif encore est le fait que la prière à la Trinité qui ouvre le traité, implore le bienfait «d'être dirigé vers le plus haut sommet, vraiment inconnaisable et tout lumineux des Ecritures mystiques»⁴. Et à son ami Timothée, Denys prédit qu'il sera dirigé «vers le Rayon suressentiel de la divine Ténèbre» (*πρὸς τὴν ὑπερώσιον τοῦ θεοῦ σκότους ἀκτῖνα*)⁵.

Mais nos recherches s'arrêtent là. Qui plus est, cette Ténèbre ne sert pas à décrire un état d'âme du mystique, conséquence

¹ Cf. H. A. Wolfson, Albinus and Plotinos on divine Attributes. Har. Th. Review 45, 1952, 115–130. ² De divinis nominibus, Chap. 7,3, 872 A.

³ De mystica theologia, Chap. 1,3, 1000 C.

⁴ ὑπέρφατης, De mystica theologia, Chap. 1, 1, 997 A.

⁵ De mystica theologia, Chap. 1,1, 1000 A.

d'une purification opérée par une grâce extraordinaire. Cette obscurité que le Pseudo-Denys veut atteindre, ne semble aucunement indiquer un fait psychologique, mais la situation du Transcendant, Dieu en tant que inaccessible. D'ailleurs, Denys se sert, pour expliquer la connaissance mystique, indifféremment du lumineux et de l'obscur.

La solution toutefois n'est pas là. Car l'attention de Denys est entièrement portée sur une autre catégorie, celle de non-connaître ou d'inconnaissance, *ἀγνωσία*. L'auteur nous facilite la découverte par sa rigueur logique dans le maniement des concepts *voir* et *connaître*. Une symétrie parfaite coordonne les données. Rappelons d'abord le premier moment, l'*ἀφαιρεσις*. *Tὰ πάντα ἀφαιροῦμεν* «Nous retranchons tout, écrit-il au second chapitre, afin de connaître à découvert cette Incognoscibilité, voilée par tout objet de connaissance dans tous les êtres, et de voir cette Ténèbre suressentielle, cachée par toute lumière qui est dans les êtres»¹.

Ce qui empêche de voir la Ténèbre de l'incognoscibilité, c'est la lumière qui nous fait voir les êtres: il faut donc renoncer à toute connaissance sensible pour entrer dans la Ténèbre. De même, ce qui nous empêche de connaître le Transcendant, c'est toute connaissance au niveau de l'être: il faut l'abandonner et préférer la montée par les négations. Vue de la Ténèbre par une non-vue, connaissance éminente d'une Incognoscibilité par un non-connaître, par l'*ἀγνωσία*.

Voilà ce qui reste de l'illumination: un non-connaître total, une *ἀγνωσία*, qui est à la fois le thème central de son traité de théologie mystique. Par la voie des négations, Denys prétend aboutir à ce non-connaître total, qu'il présente comme la véritable connaissance de Dieu. C'est le terme d'une démarche qu'il appelle «une théologie négative».

Le troisième stade enfin est le perfectionnement, la *τελείωσις*. L'abbé Roques, qui dans son livre «L'Univers dionysien» a longuement analysé l'activité hiérarchique², déclare qu'ici, deux termes *τελείωσις* et *ἐνώσις* sont souvent employés l'un pour l'autre. Et il ajoute «qu'il semble toutefois que le concept d'*ἐνώσις* soit d'extension plus large que celui de *τελείωσις* qu'il englobe, en même temps que ceux de *κάθαρσις* et d'*ἔλλαψη*. Ces trois

¹ De *mystica theologia*, Chap. 2, 1, 1025 B.

² R. Roques, *L'Univers dionysien*, Paris, 1954.

opérations constituent les aspects complémentaires de l'unification¹.

Dans le traité de la *Théologie Mystique*, un tel choix ne nous est pas donné. Il n'est question que de ἐνώσις, d'union à Dieu, pour désigner une troisième étape. Dans la démarche mystique, telle que la préconise l'Aréopagite, cette ἐνώσις ou union à Dieu en est le but final. Car dans sa recherche du Transcendant, c'est le désir d'être uni à Dieu qui met tout en branle. Il inspire et anime l'effort, qui déployé par la négation abstractive, l'ἀφαλεσίς, culmine dans le non-connaître total, dans l'ἀγνωσία. Dieu étant l'Inconnaisable, l'homme qui veut vraiment être uni à Lui, n'a d'autre issue que de chercher une similitude de cet En-Soi par un non-connaître total. C'est la montée par les négations qui le fait aboutir à cette attitude. Comme Denys prétend de Moïse : «et il est uni, selon un mode meilleur, à Celui qui est totalement Inconnaisable, par une inactivité de toute connaissance, connaissant au-delà de l'intelligence par le fait de ne rien connaître»².

En conclusion : nous ne retrouvons pas, dans le traité de la *Théologie mystique*, la division ternaire qui régit toute l'activité des anges et des différentes fonctions de l'Eglise dans les deux hiérarchies dionysiennes, c'est-à-dire, la distinction entre purification, illumination et perfection.

En revanche, nous y découvrons une autre progression en trois temps, dont seulement le premier — la purification — et le dernier — l'union — présentent quelque ressemblance. Ceux-ci conservent cependant assez de particularités, qui leur donnent un caractère typique, différent des descriptions traditionnelles de la théologie spirituelle.

Le second moment, l'illumination, a été totalement transformé par le pseudo-Denys. A l'encontre d'une connaissance commune de Dieu qui procède par affirmations, l'auteur propose un non-connaître, altitude de l'intelligence qui résulte d'un processus logique des négations. De cette ἀγνωσία, il se fait le défenseur énergique.

A moitié cachée sous le masque d'un langage mystique, déroutant parfois par l'extrême rigueur logique de sa construction, cette division ternaire ne percera pas dans la tradition spirituelle. Elle cédera la place à l'autre triade de purification, d'illumination et de perfection, qui deviendra, jusqu'à nos jours au moins, l'enseignement des maîtres spirituels.

¹ O. c. p. 95 note 3.

² De mystica theologia, Chap. 1,3, 1001 A.